Desk

modern language notes

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

VOL. LXXII, NO. 8, DECEMBER 1957

REVIEWS

modern language notes

Published eight times annually, November through June. Subscription: $6.00 in the United States; $6.25 in Canada; $6.50 in other countries. Single issue, $1.00. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Md.

Contributors and publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped return envelope. In preparing manuscripts, contributors are requested to follow the MLA Style Sheet.

Entered as Second-class Matter at the Baltimore, Md., Postoffice. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Sec. 1103, Act of Congress, 16 July 1894.

lton's

Rise

s and
ORSE)
FELD)

Tol-

hrough
; $6.25
, $1.00.
should
8, Md.

scripts
s, The
Every
return
ors are

e, Md.,
ate of
ngress,

n
L
n

V
o

pr
z
8.
z
p
ti

n
c
st
d
p
f
s
tl
tl
a

v

modern language notes

VOL. LXXII, NO. 8, DECEMBER 1957

Verner's Law in the Preterit Tense of the Gothic Reduplicating Verb *Slepan*

Slepan ' to sleep ' is the only verb in Gothic which by Verner's Law preserved the shift of *s > z in the preterit pl. paradigm. Both *s* and *z* occur in the *sg.* as well as in the pl. paradigm: *s* in *sai-slep* (Mark 8. 24), *ana-sai-slep* (Luke 8. 23), *ana-sai-slepun* (I Thess. 4. 14), and *z* in *ga-sai-zlep* (John 11. 11), *ga-sai-zlepun* (I Cor. 15. 6). It is the purpose of this paper to determine the factors which caused the restriction of the *z* to this one verb *slepan*.

Since in the non-reduplicating class of the strong verbs the *z was never preserved in the preterit pl. paradigm and did not stand in a consonant cluster, we must approach the problem first (a) from the standpoint of the non-reduplicating class as contrasted with the reduplicating class with single *s* in the preterit pl. paradigm. This comparison between the two classes will enable us to determine in how far these two factors (initial *sl-* vs. initial *s-*, and the reduplicating suffix *sai-* vs. no suffix) were responsible for the retention of the *z* in the preterit pl. paradigm of *slepan*. The next step (b) is to determine the phonetic factors connected with initial *s* plus *l* and initial *s* plus a consonant other than *l* in the reduplicating class. Analogy (leveling

of *z > s in favor of the sg. paradigm) is of course a fundamental factor in both (a) and (b).

(a) In the non-reduplicating class the *s* always occurred in the preterit pl. paradigm: e. g. *reisan* 'to rise,' *rais*: *risun*; *kiusan* 'to choose,' *kaus*: *kusun*, *wisan* 'to be,' *was*: *wesun*, and the like. Here it is obvious that the original *z in the pl. paradigm was leveled in favor of the phonetically correct *s* in the sg. paradigm. The only reduplicating verb with single initial *s* in the stem syllable is *saian* 'to sow,' *sai-so*: *sai-soun*. Here we may assume that the original *z in the pl. paradigm was leveled in favor of the *s* in the sg. paradigm, as in the non-reduplicating class, unless the accent rested (before the time when Verner's Law became operative) upon the stem syllable in the sg. paradigm, resulting in the shift of *s > *z: **sĕ-sṓ* > **sĕ-zṓ* > ON *sera*. The *r* (< *R < *z) in ON *se-r-a*, however, furnishes no proof of this prehistoric accentuation because Proto-Germ. *ō (= Goth. *ō*) never yielded *a* except in *unaccented* syllables (cf. Goth. *fiskōn* 'to fish': *fiskōda* > ON *fiska*: *fiskaða*).[1] *PG *sĕ-zṓ* would have yielded PN **se-Rō*, but it is of course possible that in the prehistorical period the accent was shifted back to the prefix syllable, resulting in the form *ser-a* with reduction of the final unaccented *ō > *a*. Against this assumption, however, is the fact that Gothic *sai-sō* cannot be separated from ON *sera*, and it is not necessary to assume a prehistorical shift of accent from the stem syllable back to the prefix syllable since Gothic *sai-sō* can be directly derived from **sḗ-sō* with the PG accent already on the prefix syllable. Both Gothic *sai-so* and ON *sera* were most probably derived from a single source, namely, PG *sḗs-ō* (with accent on the prefix syllable) = Gothic *sai-so*: PN **sesō* > ON **se-s-a* > *se-r-a* with *-r-* borrowed from the pl. paradigm (*se-r-un*) where it was phonetically correct. We may therefore postulate *sai-so*: **sai-zoun* as the phonetically correct Gothic forms. Since only *s* occurs in the pl. paradigm (*sai-soun*), this *s* must have been borrowed from the sg. paradigm (*sai-so*), must probably under the influence of the non-reduplicating class, in which the original *z stood in intervocalic position, parallel to the reduplicating verb *saian* with single initial *s*-: cf. **wǣ-z-un* > *we-s-un*, hence **sĕ-zō-un* > *sai-so-un*.

(b) By the same token we may postulate *sai-slep*: *sai-zlepun* as the phonetically correct Gothic forms. That the *z* was retained in the

[1] Streitberg (*UG*, 328) favors the assumption that Gothic *sai-so*:ON *sera* reflect PG *sĕ-zṓ*, but he does not explain how the final *ō in the accented syllable could yield ON *-a*, or why the *z was not retained in the Gothic form.

pl. paradigm may best be explained as due to the fact that the *z* in the cluster *zl* was anomalous — *slepan* is the only reduplicating verb with initial *sl* in the stem syllable — and therefore the *z* in the cluster *zl* escaped the influence of the established type of single *s* in the pl. paradigm of the non-reduplicating verbs. Later this *z* was supplanted by *s* after the pattern of the reduplicating verb *saian* (*sai-slepun* like *sai-soun*) with single initial *s*- (cf. *a*, above). The *z* in the pl. paradigm was transferred to the sg. paradigm (*sai-zlepun*: *sai-zlep*) as in the North and West Gmc non-reduplicating class (cf. **wǣ-z-un* > ON *vǫ-r-un*: *vas* > *var*; MHG *wā-r-en*: *was* > NHG *war*). This variation of phonetically correct *s*: *z* led to analogical variations (leveling) in both directions: *z* for *s* (*sai-zlep*) and *s* for *z* (*sai-slepun*). The leveling of *z* > *s* (*sai-zlepun* > *sai-slepun*) may have in part been due to the influence of the reduplicating verbs with initial *sk*- and *st*- of the stem syllable, in which the *s* could not be shifted to *z* in the preterit pl. paradigm because the *s* before the voiceless stops *k* and *t* necessarily remained voiceless in the indivisible clusters *sk* and *st*; hence *skaidan* 'to divide,' *skai-skaiþ*: *skai-skaidun*; (*ga*)*staldan* 'to acquire,' *stai-stald*: *stai-staldun*, to which pattern *sai-slep*: *sai-slepun* (with initial *s*-) conformed.

University of Kansas ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT

Blake on the Nature and Origins of Pagan Gods and Myths

Scattered throughout Blake's poetry and prose are a number of criticisms of the pagan tradition in general and its mythology in particular, criticisms which on the surface at least seem almost wholly adverse. In his commentary on the poetry of the ancients, for example, Blake asserts that " Sacred Truth has pronounced that Greece & Rome, as Babylon & Egypt, so far from being parents of Arts & Sciences as they pretend, were destroyers of all Art. Homer, Virgil & Ovid confirm this opinion & make us reverence The Word of God, the only light of antiquity that remains unperverted by War." [1] Elsewhere he denounces the writings of principal ancient pagans as " Stolen

[1] *The Poetry and Prose of William Blake*, ed. Geoffrey Keynes, Nonesuch Press (London, 1927), p. 768. All Blake quotations are taken from this edition.

and Perverted," and he characterizes their fabulous systems as the "rattletrap" and "detestable gods of Priam," whose utility for modern poetic inspiration has long been outlived. The following verses characterize forcefully this attitude:

> If it is True, what the Prophets write,
> That the Heathen Gods are all stocks & stones,
> Shall we, for the sake of being Polite,
> Feed them with the juice of our marrow bones?
>
> And if Bezaleel & Aholiab drew
> What the Finger of God pointed to their View,
> Shall we suffer the Roman & Grecian Rods
> To compell us to worship them as Gods?
>
> They stole them from the Temple of the Lord,
> And Worshipp'd them that they might make
> Inspired Art Abhorr'd.
>
> The Wood & Stone were call'd The Holy Things
> And their Sublime Intent given to their Kings,
> All the Atonements of Jehovah spurn'd,
> And Criminals to Sacrifices Turn'd.

However, Blake qualifies significantly a number of his derogatory assertions on the nature of pagan myth, for in some kinds of fables he discerns evidence of that genuine imagination which the Scriptures so eminently manifest. "Let it here be Noted," he declares, in distinguishing allegory from vision or true poetic imagination, "that the Greek Fables originated in Spiritual Mystery & Real Visions, which are lost & clouded in Fable & Allegory, while the Hebrew Bible & the Greek Gospel are Genuine, Preserv'd by the Saviour's Mercy" (p. 830). So too, while Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Apuleius's *Golden Asse,* among others of a like kind, are fable, "yet they contain Vision in a sublime degree, being derived from real Vision in More ancient Writings" (p. 831). Blake is here, in effect, suggesting a primary distinction between two sorts of pagan fable, the one "original" and the other "derived," but both of which in different degrees contain that spiritual vision which he associates with the Bible. In genuine poetic inspiration, the first was apparently coeval and once coequal with the Scriptures; this kind of fable originated in "Real Vision," that archetypal source of true imagination which was once in the remote history of mankind, Blake believed, the preëminent mode of perception. But when its unity was violated the profane tradition came into being, and allegory succeeded the spiritual or symbolic

capability of perceiving ultimate reality. The second kind of fable, represented in Ovid and Apuleius, was more directly copied or derived from the sacred writings themselves, and though these and other fabulous works of the same stamp are much debased, yet they too preserve something essentially characteristic of spiritual truth.

As to how, precisely, true vision was debased into allegorical fable, Blake details no single and consistent theory. Yet, if we place his ideas on this problem into the context of eighteenth-century thought, we can understand more clearly his ambiguous attitude towards paganism: his alliance of fable in one context with the imaginative truth of Scripture; in another with derived spiritual insight; and in another with the vicious corruption of original divine inspiration. Specifically, Blake's apparently heterogeneous comments on the nature and origins of pagan myth are elucidated and rendered more homogeneous if we compare them with ideas regarding the interrelations of sacred and profane antiquity which had been entertained by such systematizers as Swedenborg, John Hutchinson, and Jacob Bryant, each of whom in different ways was concerned with harmonizing the diverse traditions of the past in order to procure for the present and future a unity of religious belief and moral action.

The central idea in Blake's thinking on the origins and character of pagan myth concerns the Poetic Genius, that spiritual faculty of perception in which he finds the common source of all ancient religious systems. This faculty was once primary in man and it gave him divine insight into ultimate reality and the true relations of things. The prophet Ezekiel had instructed him, Blake records in *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*, that "The philosophy of the east taught the first principles of human perception: some nations held one principle for the origin, and some another; we of Israel taught that the Poetic Genius (as you now call it) was the first principle and all the others merely derivative, which was the cause of our despising the Priests & Philosophers of other countries, and prophecying that all Gods would at last be proved to originate in ours & to be the tributaries of the Poetic Genius. . . ." The same point he had made earlier in the postulates of *All Religions Are One*: all systems of divinity stemmed in the beginning from the Poetic Genius, their differences being due simply to the multiform reception by each nation of that "Spirit of Prophecy." "The Jewish and Christian Testaments," he proceeds, "are an original derivation from the Poetic Genius . . . ," for they preserve in purity the revelation from the

one true source of all wisdom and knowledge. On the other hand, other ancient religions modified, corrupted, or completely forsook the revelation of Poetic Genius; thus arose idolatry and mythology. One way in which that divine faculty of perception was vitiated Blake indicates at length in another section of *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*:

> The ancient Poets animated all sensible objects with Gods or Geniuses, calling them by the names and adorning them with the properties of woods, rivers, mountains, lakes, cities, nations, and whatever their enlarged & numerous senses could perceive.
>
> And particularly they studied the genius of each city & country, placing it under its mental deity;
>
> Till a system was formed, which some took advantage of, & enslav'd the vulgar by attempting to realize or abstract the mental deities from their objects: thus began Priesthood;
>
> Choosing forms of worship from poetic tales.
>
> And at length they pronounc'd that the Gods had order'd such things. Thus men forgot that All deities reside in the human breast.

In its pristine state, then, the Poetic Genius was a pure myth-making faculty, not arbitrary in its creations, but naturally expressive of man's consciousness of reality; the systematizers and the interpreters, not the original myth-makers, adulterated it, transforming natural constructs of the poetic imagination into abstractions, allegorical fables and meaningless idols. Beneath these excrescences, however, Blake could detect a faint glimmer of genuine inspiration—the same inspiration which refulgently glowed in the sacred testaments.

An analagous conception regarding the original nature and loss of pure mythic vision among the most ancient patriarchs—one which places Blake's ideas on the debasement of Poetic Genius into fable in a larger context and gives them sharper focus—is set forth by Swedenborg as a corollary of his doctrine of correspondences. For Swedenborg the first members of the human race, who were "celestial" men, "thought from correspondences themselves, the natural things of the world before their eyes serving them as a means of thinking in this way; and that they could be in fellowship with angels and talk with them because they so thought, and that through them heaven was conjoined to the world." [2] This was the Golden Age. All the ancient churches, and in particular the churches of the Children of Israel, their statutes, their rites, in short their entire

[2] *Heaven and Its Wonders and Hell*, Standard ed., Swedenborg Foundation (New York, 1938), p. 64.

worship, were churches representative of spiritual things and consisted of pure correspondences. "The hieroglyphics," he notes further, "as well as the fables of the most ancient times, were nothing but correspondences," for the ancients had transmitted the knowledge of correspondences to their posterity, whence it came to pass that "in many kingdoms of Asia the knowledge of correspondences both existed and was cultivated, especially in the land of Canaan, in Egypt, in Assyria, Chaldea, Tyre, Sidon and Nineveh, and that it was thence carried into Greece; but was there turned into myths, as can be seen from the writings of the ancient Greeks." [3]

The process by which pagan myth resulted from original spiritual vision Swedenborg explains in *The True Christian Religion.* Gradually, in the course of time this divine mode of perceiving diminished and men "thought not from correspondences, but from a knowledge of correspondences," whereby finally the understanding of their true significance was wholly lost. Therein began mythology and idolatry:

> The idolatries of nations in ancient times originated in a knowledge of correspondences, since all things visible on earth correspond; thus not only the trees, but all kinds of beasts and birds, also fishes, and all other things. The ancients, who had a knowledge of correspondences, made for themselves images corresponding to heavenly things, and took delight in them because they signified such things as belong to heaven and the church. . . . When the knowledge of correspondences had perished, their posterity, because these images and figures had been placed by the ancients in and near their temples, began to worship them as holy, and finally as deities (I, 302).

The Iron Age of fable succeeded thus the Golden Age of archetypal spiritual perception. Or as Blake generalizes the point, through the agency of the "Daughters of Memory," the Greek Muses, "Reality was Forgot, & the Vanities of Time & Space only Remember'd & call'd Reality. Such is the mighty difference between Allegoric Fable and Spiritual Mystery" (p. 830).

Another of Blake's interesting speculations regarding the perversion of spiritual vision and the subsequent rise of fabulous systems concerns the mystic emblem of the cherubim, a sacred archetypal symbol which he conceived as the creation of pure vision or Poetic Genius. The gods of Greece, patterned upon the cherubim, were once characterized by the same imaginative genius as the sacred emblem: "The Gods of Priam," Blake asserts, "are the Cherubim of Moses and Solomon, the Hosts of Heaven" (p. 764). But whereas the symbol

[3] *The True Christian Religion* (New York, 1938), I, 300.

of the cherubim preserved its mystic meaning in the sacred tradition, the images of the gods were degraded and vulgarized among the pagans. This distinction is elucidated by Blake in the commentary on his sketch of Chaucer's pilgrims, where he remarks that the characters of *The Canterbury Tales* are "characters which compose all ages and nations" and incorporate the "lineaments of universal life." Chaucer, true poet that he was, had apprehended eternal principles:

Visions of these eternal principles or characters of human life appear to poets, in all ages; the Grecian gods were the ancient Cherubim of Phoenicia; but the Greeks and since them the Moderns, have neglected to subdue the gods of Priam. These gods are visions of eternal attributes, or divine names, which when erected into gods, become destructive to humanity. They ought to be made to sacrifice to Man, and not man compelled to sacrifice to them; for when separated from man or humanity, who is Jesus the Saviour, the vine of eternity, they are thieves and rebels, they are destroyers (p. 788).

When therefore the function of the gods in relation to man was misconceived, their resemblance to the cherubim ceased. They were no longer symbolic modes of apprehending reality, but idols merely, exacting from their worshippers cruel sacrifice. Unlike the emblem of the cherubim, which retained its mystic powers, the gods became ends in themselves, and vicious ones at that.

Likewise, Blake perceives an integral relationship between major Greek art and the cherubim. Of his Laocoon Group, for example, he declares that the Greek forms originally signified Jehovah and his two sons, Satan and Adam, "as they were copied from the cherubim of Solomon's Temple by three Rhodians & applied to Natural Fact, or History of Ilium." Other artistic creations of the Greeks, as well as those of other ancient civilizations, were derived in the same way from "stupendous originals" such as the cherubim, as Blake maintains in the notes on his engraving of the spiritual forms of Nelson and Pitt, where he likens his "compositions of a mythological cast" to those

Apotheoses of Persian, Hindoo, and Egyptian Antiquity, which are still preserved on rude monuments, being copies from some stupendous originals now lost or perhaps buried till some happier age. The Artist having been taken in vision into the ancient republics, monarchies, and patriarchates of Asia has seen those wonderful originals, called in the Sacred Scriptures the Cherubim, which were sculptured and painted on the walls of Temples, Towers, Cities, Palaces, and erected in the highly cultivated states of Egypt, Moab, Edom, Aram, among the Rivers of Paradise, being originals from which the Greeks and Hetrurians copied Hercules Farnese, Venus of Medicis, Apollo Belvidere,

and all the grand works of ancient art. They were executed in a very superior style to those justly admired copies, being with their accompaniments terrific and grand in the highest degree (pp. 780-781).

The cherubim thus constituted for Blake a key link in bringing together the sacred and profane traditions in religion and art. The emblem, indeed, was one of the grand sources of pagan culture, but unfortunately the pagans misapplied or corrupted the true meaning of their models. In so far, however, that the elements of their culture still reflected the signs of Poetic Genius, they were worthy of study and admiration. But no one could believe, Blake was convinced, that Homer's or Ovid's mythology was the original production of Greece and Rome. "The Greek Muses are the daughters of Mnemosyne, or Memory, and not of Inspiration or Imagination, therefore not the authors of such sublime conceptions" (p. 781). The archetypes of pagan gods, myths, and art were the inventions of truly inspired Asiatic patriarchs.

For his belief that forms of pagan culture were traceable in one way or another to the cherubim, Blake could have found a close analogy, if not a precedent, in the speculations of the Hutchinsonians, a group of theologians whose basic doctrines were formulated by John Hutchinson (1674-1737). Hutchinson's entire theological and philosophical effort (collected in 1748 in twelve volumes) was to restore the primeval purity and perfection of the Hebrew Scriptures, which, he claimed, had been wilfully perverted by "apostate" Jews and deceitful translators in order to mask the fullness of the Christian tenets contained therein. Cleared of such "modern" innovations as points (which were nothing less than "Rabbi forgeries") and interpreted hieroglyphically, the "original" Scriptures revealed the cardinal dispensations of Christianity, and more, they exhibited a complete system of theology and natural philosophy, thereby rendering contemporary demonstrations of revealed or natural religion, as well as mathematical proofs of the order of nature, not only superfluous but indeed heretical. Millenia before Newton, Clarke, and the deists, Moses had divinely inscribed in the first Hebrew texts the one true universal system, God's *Principia.*

Such notions, formulated as they were in a style which was lucid only when it was abusive, elicited from prominent theologians what they rightly deserved, silent contempt. But several of Hutchinson's basic postulates, modified and cogently related to contemporary theological problems, found enthusiastic followers among several parish

rectors, and more eminently, among a group of Oxford scholars which included George Horne (later Bishop of Norwich), Walter Hodges (who became Provost of Oriel College), and William Jones (afterwards Rector of Nayland).[4] For these men, the principal feature of Hutchinson's theories was the cherubim, a holy hieroglyph in which they discerned, among much else, the Christian Trinity, and from the subsequent misinterpretations of that emblem they traced the origins of central forms in heathen idolatry and mythology. Under what various guises the pagans imitated and worshipped the cherubim Hutchinson set forth at length in his *Covenant in The Cherubim* (1734), wherein he shows that the chief symbols of heathen worship, such as the eagle, lion, ox, serpent, and numerous elemental deities, were copied directly or modelled upon the hieroglyphic figures of the cherubim. In the words of John Parkhurst, the Hutchinsonian lexicographer, "The Heathens used these emblematic animals, or the like, sometimes separate, sometimes joined in various manners, as representative of the Material Trinity [fire, light, and air], which they adored. These particulars Mr. Hutchinson has proved with a variety of useful learning, vol. VII, p. 381, & *seq.* and any person who is familiar with the heathen mythology, will be able to increase his valuable collection with many instances of the same kind from modern as well as ancient accounts of pagan religions."[5] Parkhurst's own list, substantiated by much fanciful etymology and "emblematic" elucidation, includes among a score of pagan deities and idols, Serapis, Diana, Chemin, Chimaera, Proserpine, Mythras, Sphynx, Gryphin, Hercules, Jupiter, Baal, Juno, and Pan. In brief, the whole pagan pantheon with nearly every object of heathen worship could be traced ultimately to archetypal signs mysteriously contained in the cherubim.

Hutchinson's particular theory about the cherubim was but one of many such modes of harmonizing sacred and pagan antiquity which were popular in the eighteenth century. Another, which supported

[4] William Romaine, Dr. William Dodd, and Benjamin Holloway, among others, also entertained Hutchinsonian principles. But the most notable disciple, at least to the minds of the Hutchinsonians themselves, was Duncan Forbes, Lord President of the Scottish Sessions, who wrote two tracts which in different degrees sought to justify Hutchinson's belief that the Hebrew Scriptures, read rightly, would invalidate or make superfluous much of the theo-physical speculations of the day. In one guise or another a number of Hutchinson's tenets persisted into the nineteenth century, as in Sir William Drummond's *Oedipus Judaicus* (1811), which allegorized the Scriptures, and in the controversies upon Mosaic cosmogony and the findings of geological research.

[5] *An Hebrew and English Lexicon Without Points* (London, 1762), pp. 364 ff.

on different grounds Hutchinson's main contention about the unity of the two traditions and to which Blake assented with conviction, was that of the Reverend Jacob Bryant. By seeking in his *New System, or, An Analysis of Antient Mythology* (1774-76) to discover the "original design, and order of those subjects, which by length of time and their own remoteness, have been rendered confused and uncertain," Bryant hoped to give a new perspective to ancient mythology and history, thereby reaffirming the authority of the Scriptures, for he felt certain that many who had hitherto been unconvinced of the truth of the Bible would be won over by new "historical" evidence. His central evidence in this task was the Deluge, of which symbolic traces could be discovered in universal myth. The ark, the dove, the sun and moon, the mundane egg—these and kindred archetypal symbols informed the true meaning of heathen mythology. And with the help of a fantastic theory of language, he could relate most of the pagan divinities to Noah and his sons or to religious symbols associated with the Deluge. It was upon such testimony that Blake could remark, apropos of the sketch of the Britons in his *Descriptive Catalogue*:

> The antiquities of every Nation under Heaven, is no less sacred than that of the Jews. They are the same thing, as Jacob Bryant and all antiquaries have proved. How other antiquities came to be neglected and disbelieved, while those of the Jews are collected and arranged, is an enquiry worthy both of the Antiquarian and the Divine. All had originally one language and one religion: this was the religion of Jesus, the everlasting Gospel.

Blake states here, in essence, the chief rationale of eighteenth-century antiquarianism. To search among druid cromlechs and pagan relics everywhere was neither idle curiosity nor aimless pedantry; it was rather to discover the interconnections between the pagan and sacred traditions, to the eternal honor of the latter.

It is evident, then, that Blake was by no means content to dismiss wholesale pagan culure as a dilution or perversion of sacred truth and therefore worthless. Judged against the theories of Swedenborg, Hutchinson, and Bryant, Blake's several analyses of the attributes of paganism show him searching for some kind of unifying thesis which would relate the achievements of the profane civilizations to the sacred tradition and at the same time allow him to account for the sublime as well as the trivial elements of those cultures. Such a thesis was provided by his ideas on the Poetic Genius and the common bond of divine inspiration which inter-linked all antiquities.

Though fallen from their erstwhile purity, beneath the layers of allegory and mistaken significance, Blake found in pagan myth and art signs of original inspiration or tokens of truth derived from emblems in the Scriptures. His adverse judgment, therefore, was directed not so much at the imaginative creations of the myth-makers as against the corrupters and allegorizers of them. What had rendered the fabulous systems effete and mechanical for poetry was the failure of poets to realize the true context and hence deeper significance of the gods and myths. Still, Blake envisioned a day when the genuine meaning of pagan myth and art would be realized fully, a time when they would be infused with new meaning and vitality. As he prophesies in his preface to *Milton*: "when the New Age is at leisure to Pronounce, all will be set right, & those Grand Works of the more ancient & consciously & professedly Inspired Men will hold their proper rank, & the Daughters of Memory shall become the Daughters of Inspiration."

The Ohio State University ALBERT J. KUHN

New Sources for Stephen Crane's War Motif

In the effort to find European models for *The Red Badge of Courage* (1895) in the works of Zola [1] and Tolstoi,[2] critics have overlooked the possible influences of Stephen Crane's rich family heritage, particularly the martial exploits of his ancestors and his father's obsession with war.[3] Willa Cather's interview with the ubiquitous Crane in

[1] Critics who stress the influence of Zola's *La Débâcle* include: Russell Blankenship, *American Literature* (New York: Henry Holt, 1931), p. 523; Oscar Cargill, *Intellectual America* (New York: Macmillan, 1941), pp. 85-86; James B. Colvert, "*The Red Badge of Courage* and a Review of Zola's *La Débâcle*," *Modern Language Notes*, LXXI (February, 1956), 98-100; and *Literary History of the United States*, II, ed. Spiller, Thorp, *et al.* (New York: Macmillan, 1949), p. 1022.

[2] Critics who stress the influence of Tolstoi's *War and Peace* and *Sevastopol* include: V. S. Pritchett, *The Living Novel* (New York: Reynal & Hitchcock, 1947), p. 173; and Lars Ahnebrink, *The Beginnings of Naturalism in American Fiction* (Upsala: American Institute, 1950), p. 347.

[3] Several critics mention other possible native American sources like *Corporal Si Klegg*, Ambrose Bierce, *Century's Battles and Leaders*, *Harper's History*, the drawings of Winslow Homer, and Walt Whitman's *Specimen Days*. See: H. T. Webster, "Wilbur F. Hinman's *Corporal Si Klegg* and Stephen Crane's *Red Badge of Courage*," *American Literature*, XI (1939), 285-293; Percy Boynton, *Literature and American Life* (New York: Ginn & Co., 1936), pp. 677-678; Thomas Beer, *Stephen Crane: A Study in American Letters*

Nebraska in 1895 suggests that earlier Cranes helped him to formulate his "imaginary" ideas on war: ". . . His ancestors had been soldiers, and he had been imagining war stories ever since he was out of knickerbockers, and in writing his first war story he had simply gone over his imaginary campaigns and selected his favorite imaginary experiences."[4] With intense pride, Crane continually marvelled over the military feats of his forefathers. Once he made a summary of their Revolutionary War record and concluded: "In those olden times the family did its duty."[5]

Stephen's father, the minister Jonathan Townley Crane, must have done his duty to these same ancestors by relating tales of their heroism and courage to his children.[6] Besides this, Jonathan Crane left behind (following his death in 1880 when Stephen was only eight) a number of his works, mostly theological, which reveal a deep interest in war. Stephen cherished his father's writings, and as late as 1900 in England, he kept a "shelf of books, for the most part the pious and theological works of various antecedent Stephen Cranes. He had been at some pains to gather together these alien products of his kin."[7]

There was more than enough in the father's books to inspire his son's war theme. Never having witnessed a battle, Jonathan Crane could still say to the readers of his pious works: "Let us again recur to military life for illustration."[8] Two of his volumes, *Arts of Intoxication*[9] and *Popular Amusements*,[10] begin with scenes of conflict. There are many other references to war in his volumes. A few point directly to *The Red Badge*. The following passage in *An Essay on Dancing* (1851), for example, foreshadows the way in which Henry Fleming dreams of the heroics associated with battle, and later, upon

(New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1923), pp. 47, 97; Van Wyck Brooks, *The Confident Years* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1952), p. 137; *The Red Badge of Courage*, ed. Robert W. Stallman (New York: Random House, 1951), pp. xii-xvi.

[4] Willa Cather, "When I Knew Stephen Crane," *The Prairie Schooner*, XXIII (1949), 235.

[5] *Stephen Crane: An Omnibus*, ed. Robert W. Stallman (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1952), pp. 689-690.

[6] For this reason, it is not surprising that one of the minister's sons, William, became an expert "in the strategy of Chancellorsville and Gettysburg" and that another son always selected appropriate gifts for the youngest child, Stephen—the romantic war tales for boys by Harry Castleman. See Beer, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

[7] *The Shock of Recognition*, ed. Edmund Wilson (New York: Doubleday, 1943), p. 671.

[8] *Methodism and its Methods* (New York: Nelson & Phillips, 1876), p. 390.

[9] *Arts of Intoxication* (New York: Carlton & Lanahan, 1870), p. 15.

[10] *Popular Amusements* (New York: Carlton & Lanahan, 1870), p. 2.

finding himself at the front, becomes disillusioned by the grim reality he has to face:

. . . Recruiting officers of the most plausible manners are sent into the large towns, their faces beaming with smiles, and their persons glittering in uniform. The banner of the Union floats over their abode; ever and anon, the stirring sounds of martial music are heard there; and those of the recruits already enlisted, who are least likely to run away, are seen reclining about the door of the rendezvous, clothed in very blue coats, and girded with very white belts, and apparently in the enjoyment of great peace of mind. And it is only when mustered into actual service, that the dreaming soldier wakes to all the bliss of hard fare, stern discipline, toilsome marches, battles, wounds, and death.[11]

Another scene, from *The Right Way* (1853), suggests the tragic ironies of battle, continually dealt with in *The Red Badge*:

Hard is the lot of the youthful hero, battling for the right, who is struck down at the first onset of some great victory, and who, as the long columns of his comrades press past him in full pursuit of the flying foe, and their exultant shouts are borne backward on the wind, lies upon the field, far in the rear, bleeding and faint, with his sword still in his feeble grasp.[12]

Finally, like his son after him, Jonathan Crane imagines (in a passage from *Arts of Intoxication*, 1870) the psychological responses of a human being under the stress of battle:

. . . We are susceptible of excitement, a mounting tide of mental, emotional, and physical energy, which rises more or less gradually, and, when at its height, sweeps along with a power to which in our cooler moments we are strangers, and things at other times impossible are done with ease. The soldier, worn down by a long march, is so weary that he can hardly carry his weapons, but when the battle opens, with its exciting sights and sounds, its rapid evolutions, its fierce passions, his once languid frame becomes as steel for strength and endurance.[13]

One can even find some evidences of animal imagery, used so frequently in *The Red Badge.* Jonathan Crane wrote of the "panther-like yell of assault," of "the strangling coils of the gigantic serpent" which crushes out "the life of nations." [14]

The above passages more than imply that Jonathan Crane was influenced by his vivid recollections of the recent Civil War and of the

[11] *An Essay On Dancing* (New York: Lane & Scott, 1851), p. 38.
[12] *The Right Way* (New York: Carlton & Phillips, 1853), pp. 138.
[13] *Arts of Intoxication*, *op. cit.*, p. 31.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 247. Also *An Essay On Dancing*, *op. cit.*, p. 39. For a further study of this imagery, see my unpublished dissertation, "Some Aspects of the Mind and Art of Stephen Crane" (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin, 1953), pp. 120-122.

military achievements of earlier Cranes; later he supplied his son with the tensions and moods of battle, with theme, imagery, and psychology. Not foreign sources but native American materials such as these served Stephen Crane so well that he created masterpieces of fiction, beginning with *The Red Badge*.

University of Rhode Island THOMAS A. GULLASON

Huet and Saint-Evremond

When, in 1690, Saint-Evremond finally received permission to end his thirty years' exile and to return to France, he politely declined, saying that most of his friends in France were dead, and that he was too old for a channel crossing. But he had other and perhaps stronger reasons for staying in England: he knew that life in a court dominated by Madame de Maintenon would offer him more austerities than pleasures. It was around 1690 that he wrote to the Duchess of Mazarin, warning her what a dull existence she would lead if she decided to return:

> Vous seriez en toute Saison
> Dans la Maison
> Comme en Prison;
> Ou feriez avec gravité
> Votre Merite
> D'une Visite
> De Parenté . . .
>
> Vous trembleriez au sacré Nom
> De Maintenon. . . .[1]

As early as 1686 he had made his own decision. This is shown by a correspondence between Daniel Huet, the Bishop of Avranches, and Henri Justel, the Huguenot savant living in London. Biographers of Huet have noted the exchange of letters but without mentioning its date or its significance. Huet refers to it in his memoirs as follows:

> Having turned my view on all sides for the purpose of inspecting the affairs of the Church of Avranches, I discovered that Charles Marquetel de St.-Evremond belonged to my flock. He had long been an exile in England, whither he had retired on account of the displeasure of the court, which he had brought upon himself, with the fear of something worse, by indulging to excess a spirit

[1] *Œuvres mêlées* (London, Vaillant, 1708), v, 235.

of ridicule. Well remembering that it is the office of a good shepherd to track the footsteps of a wandering sheep, and bring him back to the fold, I wrote to *Henry Justell*, our common friend, and requested him that he would call upon Saint-Evremond in my name and waken in him the desire of revisiting his country; adding that perhaps, by the intervention and solicitation of my friends, I might obtain for him the liberty of returning to his family. But he had struck such deep roots in England that he appeared almost to have forgotten France; and besides, pleading the infirmity of age, he said that he chose to die and be buried there.[2]

Thus did the worthy churchman go out of his way to lend a hand to the discreet but impenitent *libertin*. "Misdirected sympathy!" exclaims one of his biographers. "Saint-Evremond n'était qu'un pauvre caractère."[3] But Huet, who had frequented courts and *salons* himself and was just as at home in the domain of literature as in the church, must have respected in Saint-Evremond the brilliant conversationalist, the connoisseur of Latin literature, and the idol of the literary *salons*.

The two letters from Justel which answer this invitation are in the Bibliothèque Nationale.[4] They are dated March 27th and July 8th, 1686. These dates reveal an inaccuracy—it is far from being the only one—in Huet's memoirs. He did not become bishop of Avranches before 1689. In 1686, when he made his offer of assistance, he was still living and studying in the little Norman abbey of Aunay. He had just been named bishop of Soissons, however, and must have felt that he might be able to use his newly acquired influence to bring about the return of his fellow-Norman Saint-Evremond.

Justel's first letter expresses Saint-Evremond's gratitude; Justel has consulted with the ambassador Barillon, and Saint-Evremond's chances of returning appear to be good:

Mr. Barillon à qui j'ai parlé de la bonté que vous aviez de vouloir songer à faire revenir Mr. de St. Evremont m'a chargé de vous en remercier et de vous supplier de vouloir travailler tout de bon à lui procurer son retour. Il m'a dit qu'il étoit nécessaire que vous fussiez instruit qu'on avait fait plusieurs tentatives pour celà, qui n'avoient point eu de succès, afin que vous prissiez vos mesures ladessus. Mr. de St. Evremont seroit bien aise de retourner dans son pays s'il étoit bien assuré d'avoir un bon patron qui le remit bien dans l'esprit du Roi; comme vous lui avez offert votre secours d'une manière tout a fait honnete, je ne doute pas que vous ne soyez en quelque

[2] *Memoirs of the Life of P. D. Huet, Bishop of Avranches*, translated from the original Latin by J. Aiken (London, 1810), p. 230.

[3] Joseph d'Avenel, *Histoire de la vie et des ouvrages de Huet, évêque d'Avranches* (Mortain, Lebel, 1853), p. 270.

[4] B. N., *fonds français* 15189, folio 277-78.

façon assuré de faire réussir cette affaire à son contentement. Il vous est infiniment obligé de la part que vous prenez dans ses interets. Mr. l'Ambassadeur en écrira quand vous aurez parlé et que vous jugerez qu'il puisse contribuer à vous faire obtenir la grace que vous demanderez pour Mr. de St. Evremont. Il faut que je vous dise encore qu'il ne pourroit pas se résoudre à aller en France s'il n'étoit assuré que quelques amis puissans n'agissent auprès du Roi pour lui persuader que les mauvaises impressions qu'on lui a donné (*sic*) de lui étoient mal fondées et qu'il ne resteroit plus rien dans son esprit contre lui. Il m'a dit de plus que Mr. de Montausier avoit fait tout ce qui se peut imaginer en sa faveur, mais inutilement. C'est ce qu'il m'a dit et que je vous écris afin que vous agissiez en conséquence.

The second letter however, written three months later, reveals Saint-Evremond's true intentions:

. . . Quant à l'affaire de Mr. de St. Evremont je crois qu'il n'y faut plus penser parce qu'il m'a paru fort éloigné de retourner dans son pays. Il m'a dit qu'il étoit trop vieux, qu'on ne le connoistroit plus en France, que ses amis étoient morts et qu'il n'y trouveroit pas ce qu'il a ici: le fait est qu'il aime trop la ville de Londres pour la quitter sans de grandes raisons. . . .

Can it be that Saint-Evremond's firm decision to remain in England came as a result of Huet's attempt to bring about his return? Probably the decision was made even earlier. A flat refusal to accept Huet's good offices would have been discourteous. Saint-Evremond therefore pretends to want to put an end to his exile, but does everything he can to discourage the good bishop. He recalls the useless efforts of friends as influential as the duc de Montausier and makes it clear that he does not want to return under a cloud. But finally he has to admit to Justel that he does not want to go back at all; he is too old, he says, and all his French friends are dead. Even this is not completely sincere, and Justel knows it: "The fact is he likes London too well to leave it."

Even at second hand, in these letters of Justel, one can recognize Saint-Evremond's cautious epicureanism. But what is especially typical of him is the delicately ambivalent way in which he greets the bishop's offer of assistance. The effort to conceal his intentions and veil his feelings, whether motivated by prudence, politeness, or irony, was habitual with him. It was a successful effort, for, although he seems to have known everyone—kings, philosophers, poets, ambassadors, rakes, charlatans, and cardsharps as well as sober theologians like Justel and Huet—he remains, among the more important authors of his time, one of the least known.

University of Indiana QUENTIN M. HOPE

An Unpublished Letter of Charles Nodier

The original autograph manuscript of this letter is Folio 247 MS 1794 in the Bibliothèque Municipale de Besançon. We do not know when Nodier was appointed to the *jury littéraire* of the opera board, but it could not have been before the end of November, 1813, when he left Quintigny to join the staff of the *Journal des Débats,* then the *Journal de l'Empire,* in Paris. For some time before that date, Nodier's friends were busy seeking a suitable position for the unemployed littérateur. Among them was General Etienne de Jouy, courtier and playwright, who had earlier, in 1809, aided Nodier in securing the post of secretary to Sir Herbert Croft in Amiens, and who was later, in 1833, to assist materially in bringing about Nodier's election to the French Academy. Jouy, who was also Spontini's librettist for *La Vestale,* is the only known possible link between Nodier and the opera board.

This position is not mentioned elsewhere in Nodier's extant correspondence, nor is it commented upon by any of his biographers. As a matter of fact, references to music in Nodier's literary works are rare indeed: nowhere do we find expressed the current infatuation with the operatic divinities of the moment, Rossini, Donizetti, and Bellini. Nodier did have an idea for the later phonograph,[1] but he was doubtless inspired in this by the writings of Cyrano de Bergerac,[2] which he was reviving. There is no trace of musical activity or of an enthusiasm for music in Nodier's background. His passion for the theater more often led him to the *théâtres des boulevards, l'Ambigu* or *les Funambules,*[3] where if there was any music in his beloved *mélodrames,* it was certainly of the lighter kind.

Paris, rue St. Lazare No. 33, 10 avril, 1817.
Monsieur le Comte,[4]

Le besoin de réparer ma santé, de me livrer à des travaux trop longtemps suspendus avec un peu d'indépendance, et surtout de mettre dans mes dépenses une économie extrêmement stricte, que le défaut de fortune et d'emploi me rend de plus en plus nécessaire, me force à quitter Paris pour la campagne

[1] Robert de Souza deals with this in an article for the *Mercure de France,* 1933, entitled, "A propos du phonographe. Charles Nodier auteur de l'idée et du mot."

[2] See *Les Œuvres libertines de Cyrano de Bergerac* (Champion, 1921), Vol. I, *Les Estats de la lune,* p. 84.

[3] See Alexandre Dumas père, *La Femme au collier de velours,* Calmann-Lévy edition, 1896, Préface, p. 21.

[4] M. le Comte de Pradel, ministre de la Maison du Roi.

et à le quitter sans probabilité de retour. Cette résolution prise depuis longtemps mais que depuis peu de jours j'entrevois la possibilité d'accomplir, me prive de l'avantage de concourir désormais aux opérations du jury littéraire de l'Académie Royale de Musique dans la composition duquel vous avez bien voulu m'admettre. Je vous prie donc, M. le Comte, de vouloir bien agréer ma démission, et de croire qu'en renonçant aux fruits de cette marque particulière de vos bontés j'en conserve un éternel souvenir et une éternelle reconnaissance.

Daignez, M. le Comte, ne pas me retirer une bienveillance à laquelle je dois déjà tant de faveurs, et qui est pour ma famille et pour moi un sujet intarissable de gratitude et d'espérance.

J'ai l'honneur d'être avec respect, M. le Comte, Votre très humble et très obéissant serviteur

Charles Nodier

Washington and Jefferson College A. RICHARD OLIVER

A New Spanish Etymological Dictionary (cont'd) *

LÁZARO. It. *lazzaretto* should not be presented under this item since I believe I have shown that the term is based on *Nazareth* (with secondary influence of *Lazarus*), cf. *WS.* 6, 201.

MACABRO. Add to the bibliography my article "La Danse macabre" (*Mélanges . . . Dauzat*, 1951, 307-321) in which another approach to the underlying folkloristic problem is proposed.

EL (DIOS) MACHÍN 'Cupid' (first attestation 1605). The etymology proposed by *Autoridades* and accepted by C. seems as unlikely to me as it did to Cuervo: Basque *Matšín*, hypocoristic form of *Martín*, meaning 'average person,' then applied to locksmiths' apprentices and then, in some 'literary' work, used of Cupid because this god was born in the forge of Vulcan. First, De Azkue does not attest Basque *Matšín* in the meaning 'locksmith's apprentice' (which meaning may then very well be an invention *ad hoc* of Spanish etymologists); secondly, why would a Spanish man of letters apply a Basque word, otherwise unknown in Spanish, to Cupid? (compare the semantic range of a word of established Basque origin such as *mochil!*); thirdly, Cupid is not currently represented, as far as I know, as a locksmith's apprentice. If then the Basque etymon is ruled out, it would be preferable to turn to French: to the stem of Fr. *machine.* Now the form *machin* (in *M. Machin*, said of a person whose name one does not wish or is unable to remember) is attested rather late: in 1807. It is usually explained as a masculine variant of *machine*, comparable morphologically to Ital. *coso* of the same meaning (< *cosa*) and semantically to Fr. *truc* used in the phrase *machin truc* 'thingumajig.' But perhaps the Spanish (*el dios*) *Machín* may serve to antedate Fr. *machin* by at least two centuries if we assume a parallel to a

* Juan Corominas, *Diccionario crítico-etimológico de la lengua castellana*, vol. III (L-Re). Bern: Francke, 1954. 1117 pp.

Fr. **le Dieu machin*. This would be a (humanistic?) rendering in the vernacular of the Latin phrase *deus ex machina* (first > **dieu-machine*, then by assimilation of gender **dieu-machin*). The Latin expression (which has a Greek ancestry) was used for the machinery by which apparitions of gods were brought about on the ancient stage. The phrase **le dieu-machin(e)* could then have been used euphemistically for the god Cupid, the author of the strangest *coups de théâtre*, whose name it is dangerous to mention. Only later would one have used, instead of *le Dieu-machin*, *Monsieur Machin* whenever one wished to leave the name of a person unmentioned or was unable to remember it. I must however confess the hypothetic nature of this explanation, which will only gain solidity if a Fr. *le Dieu-machin* is found.

MACHUCA (s. v. *macho* II), the surname of a valiant 13th cent. knight. C. explains this name from the noun *machuca* (< **matteuca*) 'mace,' rather than from the imperative of the verb *machucar*; he is sceptical of the story reported in a chronicle to the effect that a fellow knight, seeing Don Diego clubbing victoriously his enemies, had exclaimed: *Así, don Diego, así ¡machuca, machuca!* But the phenomenon of an imperatival name by which the person so named is asked to *continue* to do what his own nature has prompted him to do spontaneously, has been explained by me in *Romania* 73, 47: the speaker takes an ironical pleasure in ordering the person he is 'creating for himself' (by giving him a surname) to do things that he has sensed as characteristic of that person, whether they be reprehensible things (Fr. *Écorche-vilain*, said to a person who is in the habit of 'écorcher le vilain'), or things to which the speaker does not take exception; e. g. the name of the troubadour *Cercamon*, literally 'wander-through-the world!,' implies an order given to him to *continue* the activity that is the characteristic trait of his profession. In the phrase *así . . . así ¡machuca, machuca!* the *así* expresses the wish of the speaker that the man whom he chooses to call *Machuca continue* the activity of *machucar*.[1]

MADRIGAL. I have rallied to Biadene's opinion (**matricalis*) in *Essays in Historical Semantics*, p. 28. Migliorini, in an article reprinted in *Studi linguistici*, 1957 (p. 287), established the existence of an Italian adjective derived from **matricalis* in the meaning 'ingenuous, natural, naïve,' literally 'as though having left the *matrix* of his mother.'

LUCAS (s. v. *maestro*) 'playing cards' < 'the picture of Christ in Lucca.' Cf. my article in *Biblos*, XXV, 5.

MAJO 'the popular Spanish type of the *chulo* who affects elegance and bravery.' Since neither M. L. Wagner's explanation (*majo*, meaning 'heavy, boring' derived from the verb *majar* 'to hammer, to molest, bore' < *malleare*), nor C.'s Arabic etymon (with its complications) is convincing, why not think of *malleus* in the meaning attested for the diminutive *malleolus* > Sp. *majuelo* 'offshoot of the vine (in form of a hammer)'? From 'offshoot' to 'boy,

[1] I may add here a personal experience: after a lecture in which I had polemized against a colleague's opinion, a gentleman from the audience came to me, patting me on the shoulder and exclaiming: *That's right. Give Dr. N. hell!* (though my supposed action of 'g.h.' was already past). *That's right* in this context corresponds exactly to the *así, así* of the O. Sp. passage.

girl' the way is easy (cf. the cases of 'rejeton, tendron' > 'boy, girl' in Ivan Pauli's book *Enfant, garçon, fille,* p. 284, seq., especially Cotgrave's entry *tendron* 'a tender, nesh, delicate or effeminate fellow'); and once *majo* had reached this stage the way was open to the meaning 'chulo' (which word itself originally meant, according to C., only 'muchacho': < It. (*fan*)*ciullo*). The fact that *majo* is attested so late (*Autoridades*) and *majuelo* not attested at all in the meaning 'boy' is not crucial in so popular a word. The Portuguese *malho* 'pessoa habil, fina, coisa certa, infalível' (which C. relates to *malho* < *malleus*) would be a confirmation of my theory ('tender' > 'fine, skilful'), not of C.'s (who explains *malho* rather laboriously: 'skilful [as the locksmith must be]').

MAMOTRETO (*s. v. mama*). Add the material I am offering in *Essays*, p. 38 (especially the interpretation of the passage of Augustine which suggests a semantic explanation different from C.'s).

MAMPERLÁN 'wooden border used to fortify steps.' I agree with the explanation of the first part of this compound (prefix *ante-* > *an-* > *mam-*), not with that of the second: *pernal* 'long stake' (< *pierna* 'leg'). Such an etymologically clear word could not possibly have been transmogrified into Sp. *-perlán, -pirlán,* Catalan *-perlá, -perlat, -perlan*(*t*). Indeed the form *mampernal,* the closest to the supposed etymon, is rather rare, if not spurious, as C. himself states. I suggest a loan-word from French: *préla*(*r*)*t* 'tarpaulin' attested since 1691, whose suffix *-ard* is secondary (cf. *épinards, poignard*) as Anjou *parlas prélâ* 'id.' shows (forms quoted by Gamillscheg), must be related to OF *prelate* 'rafter of a roof' (*la latte et prélate*), *prelater* 'to put rafters on a roof,' both attested c. 1443 by Godefroy, which are obviously compounds of *latte* 'lath,' *latter* 'to lath,' *Prélat,* Anjou *parlas, prélâ* are then postverbal nouns from *prelater,* meaning first * 'cover,' then 'tarpaulin.' The Catalan forms *-perlá*(*t*) are the closest to the Fr. word-family. It is in Catalonia or adjacent territory that a *-perlá* was transposed into *-perlán* (according to the pattern *pa–pan* < *panis*). The Catalan form *pislán* must be a reconstruction form **pel-lán* according to the pattern *trel.lat* < *treslat* (< *translatum*). Sp. (*mam*)*pelaño* may be a transposition of Cat. *perlán* (parallel to *perpiaño* < Fr. *parpaing*?). If Sp. *peldaño* 'step' belongs to (*mam*)*perlán,* as C. suspects, we could explain its *ld* (as in *cella* > *celda*) from a Catal. **pel.lán.*

MELLAR. The passage from the *Dotrina de la Discrición,* not understandable to C.: *faze yerro sy non mella / en el tal engxemplo ella* [a highborn, noble lady], the verb *mella* has obviously the sense '(if she does not) conform (to the example, or exemplary behavior).' The metaphor is the same as in Eng. *to tally,* 'to split a piece of wood lengthwise *through the notches* so that the parts exactly correspond, the seller keeping one stick, the purchaser the other' > 'to make to correspond, to cause to agree' and in *to indent,* 'to sever the parts of a document so as to correspond' > 'to agree' (*mella* = 'dent'). C.'s etymon *mella* < **mendula* 'defect' seems to me beyond doubt, also phonetically (cf. *glandula* > *agalla*): the case of *amygdala* > *almendra,* a name of a fruit imported from Greece, may belong to another historical stratum.

MATUTE. Add Basque *matuta* 'morning-bell' (De Azkue). The *estoile matute* of Rabelais (in a passage crowded with solemn Latinisms) may be due to a learned reminiscence of the ancient Roman goddess *Matuta* from whose name *matutinus* is derived. The Sp. *de matute*, on the contrary, makes the impression of a jocular formation coined by students who replaced *de mane* 'in the morning' by a more stilted *de matute* (from which then the humorous Sp. meaning '[wares smuggled] in the early morning' must be derived).

MERODEAR. C. leans more toward Gamillscheg's etymology of Fr. *maraud* (< OF *mar!*, the exclamation meaning 'I unfortunate one, woe to me!') than to Sainéan's (and mine, *Rom. Forsch.* 62, V. 47): < *maraud* 'tom-cat,' his main argument being the fact that while *maraud* 'tom-cat' is found in modern Fr. dialects, in the medieval attestations of the word no allusion to the cat's characteristic traits: slyness, hypocrisy, prowling is found, only a general meaning: 'miserable, destitute.' Granting this difficulty (which however is not absolute, given the deficiency of our information about the medieval spoken language), I must reject absolutely the idea of such a derivation from *mar*: Do noun derivations from words such as *woe! alas!* exist in any language?

MISTIFICAR < Fr. *mystifier*, of unknown origin. Littré reports about the first appearance of the word in the 18th century, on the occasion of a particular 'mystification' whose victim was the writer Poinsinet (one remembers that Goethe in *Dichtung und Wahrheit* devotes a passage to the habit of mystification current in certain circles in his youth, v. also Schulz-Basler, *Deutsches Fremdwörterbuch*), but suspects older antecedents: such 16th cent. words as *mistigouri* and *mystigorfier*. For the latter he gives no source; the first is attested by Godefroy only once with Cholières in a series of hypocoristic words of obscene origin (*mon couillaud, ma vitte, mon petit mistigoury*) and is obviously identical with *mistigri*, one of the dialectal (Anjou) names of the cat (= *miste gris* according to Sainéan I, 56, *miste* 'cat' being a widespread term, cf. also *cache-mistouri* 'blind man's buff' I, 51), which are always susceptible of obscene meanings (Fr. *chat* 'pubis féminin'). But Littré fails to mention the adjective *mistigorieux* listed by Godefroy (in a passage: "Croyez qu'il y a des besongnes / et des mots mistigorieux / si tres fort mistigorieux / qu'on n'y entend la belle note") which must mean 'obscure' (not 'mirifique,' as Godefroy translates) and is obviously a blend of *allegorie* + *mystique, mystère*, as it were **myst-(all)égorieux*. From this adjective the verb *mistigorfier* (if it exists) must be a derivative (by means of the sometimes jocular suffix *-fier*, cf. *cocufier*, Engl. *transmogrify* < *-fier*), and our *mystifier* would be a shortening from **mystigor(f)ier*. The likelihood of such blends is proven by Fr. *amphigouri* (attested in the 18th cent.), which Dauzat explains as *allégorie* + one of the compounds with *amphi-* (I would suggest more specifically a blend of *allégorie* with *amphibol(og)ie*). The terms *mistigouri* and *-mistouri* mentioned above as belonging to another family may be influenced by **mystigorie* in the meaning 'chose cachée.'

MONSERGA 'confused, obscure speech.' C. has given by his arguments a death blow to Brüch's suggestion: < Prov. *monserga* 'lie,' but he leaves the word unexplained. I propose a verb derived from Fr. *monsieur* as it is pronounced outside of France: Sp. *monsiur* (v. the passage quoted from *Estebanillo Gon-*

zález by C., s. v. *palo*), *monsior* in Port. (Figueiredo), *mossur* in Catalan (Aguiló), *moussu* in Provençal. In the latter language we find derivative verbs such as *moussureja mounseia* 'faire le monsieur, traiter de monsieur' (*vers moussurejats* 'pompous verse' in the passage given by Mistral), *s'amoussuri* 'prendre des airs de monsieur.' From a parallel (or borrowed) Span. **monsurgar* a postverbal noun **monsurga* may have been formed which, under the influence of *jerga* 'jargon,' would have become *monserga*.

MORENO (s. v. *moro*). Must one, for a form extending so far into Provençal territory, think of a pre-Romance or Hispano-Arabic form, instead of comparing the suffix with that of *Sarraceni* and *Agareni*?

MÚTIS 'silence!' (s. v. *mudo*). C. points out that the word is originally not an order to be silent (and, consequently, not to be retraced to Lat. *mutus* with inmixture of an *-is* as in *in albis*), but the term of the prompter who enjoins an actor to leave the stage (and consequently to be retraced to an It. *mùtisi* 'move!' from old Italian *mutarsi* in that meaning). However the phrase, although theoretically possible, is nowhere attested as a stage direction (it would have to be a creation of a period when the pronoun of address *lei* was firmly established). C. has not taken into account the Prov. *mútus* 'chut, silence! en style burlesque,' *resta chútus* 'se taire, en style burlesque,' *chútis et mútis* 'discrétion et silence' (Mistral) nor the Fr. *motus*! 'idem' which is attested since Richer (1662) and is generally explained as a facetious Latinization of *mot* ('pas un mot!'). Now among the 17th cent. examples offered by Livet we find several in which *motus*! is accompanied by another word meaning 'silence!': Richer: '[Le vieillard jura] d'*observer le chut*, motus'; La Fontaine: 'encore un coup, *motus, bouche cousue*!,' Regnard: '*motus, il faut se taire*'—a circumstance which may suggest that *motus* originally did not mean 'silence!,' only took on this meaning because of its association with *chut, bouche consue*, etc. '*Motus*!' was then probably the Latin word *motus* 'movement, motion,' used in Latin school plays precisely for what C. thinks the original meaning of Sp. *mútis* to have been: the order of the prompter to the actor to leave the stage (which implied his becoming silent). *Motus*!, after having reached the meaning 'silence!,' was then doubtless influenced by *chut*! (Prov. *chútus e mútus*) which was then in turn facetiously transformed into *chútis et mútis*—hence the Sp. *mútis*.

MURGAÑO, variant of *musaraña* 'shrew mouse,' is explained as a *mur*(*e*) *araneus* (which would have come about after the nominative *mus* was replaced by *mure*), then dissimilated to **mureganeus*. But C. fails to attest any other case of a dissimilation *r* — *r* > *r* — *g*. I would then prefer to explain the type *murgaño* as a blend between *musaraña* (< *mus aranea*) + the stem of *hurgar* 'to ferret' < *furicare*, C.

NIQUISCOCIO 'negocio despreciable' (s. v. *ocio*) has probably nothing to do with Sp. *quisquilla* whose existence is doubtful according to C. himself (s. v. *quisquilloso*), but contains either Lat. *nihil*, pronounced *niquil* (cf. argot forms such as *nicles*) or Germanic *nichts* (in Southern dialects *nix*), which may have come to Spain via the Swiss mercenaries: **niquis* [*n*]*egocio* = no business!

OÍSLO 'wife' (s. v. *oir*). Add to the bibliography my study in *Rom. Forsch.*, LXI, 21.

PACA II: the form *paccone* in Jacopone da Todi is now translated in Arese's revision of the *Crestomazia* of Monaci 'fetta di porco, pezzo di carne' and related to REW 889 (Sard. *baccone*).

PAGANO (s. v. *pago*). The semantic development of *paganus* to 'heathen' should be revised in line with the much more complicated facts revealed by Rheinfelder, *Kultsprache und Profansprache*, p. 131 and Boscherini, *Lingua nostra* 17, 101.

PAN. Here and s. v. *queso*, the type *paniqueso panquesillo* with its different semantic developments (cf. REW, 6198 and also my article ZRPh 36, 724) is missing.

QUE PATATÍN PALATÁN, s. v. *patatús*. Cf. also Fr. *et patati patata*, the end of a speech in which one repeats mockingly the chatter of someone else, and my article on *pataquès* 'mistake in French *liaison*' (originally *pataqui-pataquiès*) in *Language* 17, 253. The onomatopeic radical *patac-* may, Corominas to the contrary, explain the name of the coin *pataca* (cf. also FEW, s. v. *pat-*).

PECHINA. Cat. *petxina* is in the Latin of zoölogists the 'pecten jacobaeus,' the comb-like shell once worn by pilgrims to St. James of Compostella. The derivation from It. *pectis* (for *pecten*) 'comb' or from *pectus* 'chest' is unconvincing, the one morphologically (should such a form occur only in Sp.?), the other semantically (the 'shell worn *on the chest*'?). Since the Cat. word shows a *tx* not genuine in this language, we must look toward Provençal in which a **penchenino* 'comb-like [shell]' from *penche* 'comb' (< **pecten-iculus*) might be reconstructed. Now what is actually attested in Provençal is only *penchinil* (*penchenil*) 'pauvre hère, homme de rien, en Languedoc' which Mistral gives as a synonym of *pelègre*[2] (which in turn is a back-formation from *pelegrin* 'pilgrim'). But since Prov. *pelerin* means 'peigne de Saint Jacques, peigne gigantesque, coquillage dont les pélerins ornent leur pèlerine' (the shell of the pilgrims), we may easily imagine a Prov. **penchenino*, with identical meaning ('the comb-like shell [of the pilgrim]'), from which Cat. *petxina*, Sp. *pechina* would be haplological borrowings.

PECHUGA (s. v. *pecho*). C. refuses to acknowledge the existence of a Sp. suffix *-ugo -a* (< Lat. *-ucus* as in *caducus*), although *peuga -a* offers clear evidence (as he himself admits s. v. *mendrugo*, which latter word I would explain as a variant of *almendruco*, 'green almond with husk': > 'hard fruit, hard piece of bread'). As to *pechuga* from *pecho*, he suggests a back-formation from the O. Sp. verb *apechugar* 'to press upon, attack, the breast of horses,' which in turn would be an **apech(i)ugar* (< **pect-ificare*) ostensibly attested as a hapax in the 13th cent.: *apechiguar a su bestia* 'to press against the mount [of the king].' But it is likelier for the latter hapax to be a (perhaps erroneous or folk-etymological) variant of *apechugar* which is always used intransitively (*apechugar con*, Dicc. hist.), while *-iguar* < *-ificare* verbs appear always used transitively (*apaciguar, apaniguar, santiguar* with object in the accusative): C.'s translation of such verbs by *poner*: 'poner

[2] Cf. the parallel semantic development of Fr. *coquillard*, South German dialectal *Pülcher* 'vagabond' < *Pilger* 'pilgrim.'

paz,' 'poner alimento' is deceptive: it is only introduced in order to produce a seemingly parallel translation of *apechiguar* 'poner el pecho en algo.' In reality an *apechiguar* could only mean 'to make sb. into a chest, provide sb. with a chest'—obviously nonsensical meanings! *Pechuga,* originally [*carne*] *pechuga,* must have meant 'fat breast (of a chicken or a horse)' with a semantic development as in **peduca* 'rustic, coarse shoe' (and in (*al*)*mendrugo,* if my explanation is correct).

PIERNA. To *hacer piernas* 'pose as a gallant, well-educated person' should be added the international synonyms Germ. *einen Kratzfuss machen,* Engl. *to scrape (make) a leg* which must be retraced to the 17th cent. obeisance that was supposed to imitate the scraping of the enamoured male pigeon making love to the female.

PIJA PICHA 'penis' s. v. PIJOTA. The existence of this Spanish onomatopeic term is corroborated by the Hungarian *picsa* 'penis' pronounced with *č,* quite usual up to this day, which must be a borrowing from Sp. since in Hung. the verb for 'to urinate' is *pisálni* (with *š,* not *č*).

PIMPINELA. The Latin botanical term *pimpinella* is older than C. supposes: it is attested with a 6th cent. herbalist, cf. Souter, *Glossary of later Latin* and my article in *Word* 1951, p. 211 (with a different etymological proposal).

(UNA) PLEPA 'a morally or physically ill person,' origin unknown. The Asturian related verb *aplipayar* 'to become sad, to mollycoddle oneself' leads me toward an assumption of an original verb **a-plipayonar* which would contain the stem of Lat. *papilio* 'butterfly' (**ad-papilion-are*), which later must have given way in Sp. to the type *mariposa,* cf. Cat. *papallona* 'butterfly' (with the *-p-* similarly maintained because of onomatopeic effect) and the verb *papallonejar.* As for the meaning, cf. Fr. *papilloter* 'sich nur teilweise entwickeln, von den Knospen des Weinstocks' (Sachs-Villatte), which would lead us toward 'become ill,' etc. Notice also the sense of Gallego *plepa* 'engaño con que se embauca a alguno,' i. e. 'deceit, lure' which could be akin to the meaning 'to blink' which Fr. *papilloter* also has. Astur. *plipayu pilpayu* 'each of the bases of the poles that sustain a barn' may originate from the idea of a tent (or tent-like barn). Astur. *aplipayar* would then be a shortened or regressive form extracted from **aplipayonar,* and Sp. *plepa* a regressive formation from *aplipayar.* Another possibility would be connection with the Gascogne stem *pempeleja* 'mener une vie languissante,' *pempel,* 'langueur physique ou morale,' FEW, s. v. *pemp-.*

PODER used transitively in Argentina (='to dominate, overcome sb.') has its antecedents in metropolitan Spain, cf. the following examples (collected by Professor Anna Hatcher): Juan de Zunzúnegui, *La vida como es* (Barcelona 1954): "Es que *no me puede* que esa tía alcuhueta tenga ni una astilla en lo que debe ser mío y solo mío"; "Al Cotufas más que la guita que ponía el perista en su mano como precio del robo, *le podía* la satisfacción de la obra bien hecha" (*idem.*); and *Teatro español* (published by Carlos Sáinz de Robles 1953): "*Riendo.* Se desmayó, nodriza. *Le pudo* su sangre. *Le pudieron* todos los carneros, y los toros que nos ha devorado."

POLÍTICO 'in-law' must surely be a legal term like the parallel term in English which contains *law* not in the sense of '*ley religiosa,*' as C. states,

but in that of 'canon law,' a meaning attested in Fr. since the 12th cent. (Gaimar, v. FEW, s. v. *lex*). *Político* must similarly mean '. . . according to canon law.'

PONCELLA. Cf. my article on Fr. *pucelle* in *Rom.* 72, 100.

PREMIA 'violence done to sb.,' O Sp. *apremiar* 'to oppress.' C. denies the possibility of *premia* being derived from *premere* and therefore has recourse to the family of *praemium* (at least as a contributive factor). *Praemiari* meant 'to reserve the booty for oneself' from which meaning the medieval one 'to oppress, do violence' could easily develop. But the medieval examples do not bear out C.'s supposition: in *non constringan ni apremien a los clérigos . . . que pechen* and similar other texts the verb has only the usual meaning 'to oppress' (here by payments exacted), as one sees by the synonym *constringan*, without any connection with 'booty reserved for oneself.' Furthermore, I am unable to join C. in his *parti-pris* (similar to that against *-ugo* < *-ucus*) against the postverbal suffix **-ium, -ia*. It is not true that no parallels to *premia* < *premere* exist, since C. himself, s. v. *ajar*, accepts **fallia* < *fallere*, and also *escarnio, concomio* (*-ium*) from *escarnir, concomer*, and since every Romance scholar will explain It. *doglia*, Prov. *dolha* as a **dolia* < *dolere*. Menéndez Pidal's idea about the productivity in Romance of the Latin pattern *desidia—desidere* is correct.

PRÉSTAMO (*préstimo*), s. v. *prestar*. I find C.'s suggestion of a **praestitum* > *empréstito, empréstido* (Nebrija) blended with another suffix with *-m-* most convincing. But the contaminating suffix could surely not be, in a word of definite juridical or Latinizing character, the pre-Romance suffix *-́amo* of *légamo, páramo* used only for terrain formations. Since the Port. (*ac*)*crécimo* 'growth, particularly of a fever' is flanked by an (*ac*)*crescimento* with the same meaning, why not admit an *-itu -a* in learned form (the popular development being the one found in *búsqueda*), influenced by the *-amentum -imentum* suffix, so that *-́amo -́imo* appear as (semi-learned) shortenings of the *-mentum* formation (cf. *escátema* with the *e-* of *búsqueda* along with *escátima*, from a radical **scatt-* (s. v.).

PRINGAR. In the first attestation of 1420 the next to last line, which matters greatly for the sense of the passage, has been omitted: *& non sé por que intención. . . .*

PRISA. In Sancho Panza's adage *en priessa me veis y virgo me demandáis* Rodríguez Marín is doubtless right in postulating an older meaning, preserved in a proverb, 'in trouble,' said euphemistically for 'pregnant.' The English phrase *a girl who got in trouble* is an exact parallel. C.'s idea of Latin *compressa*, said of the sexual act directed toward a woman, then replaced by *impressa* > **empriesa* 'pregnant,' which phrase in turn would have been wrongly decomposed into *en priessa*, is far-fetched (not all the women who are *compressae* become pregnant).

PRIVADO 'quickly.' I think that my explanation from phrases such as *cavalgar privado* 'to go on a private mission' > 'to go quickly' is correct beyond doubt, buttressed not only by the modern international phrase *express train* (German *Expressbrief*, not *expresse*, as C. writes), but by Spanish *proprio* (*de urgencia*) 'Eilbote' (Slaby-Grossmann), which C. himself uses

in order to explain my suggestion: 'ir en calidad de *propio*, o mensajero particular.' The passage from Berceo quoted by C. (*lo ál non á raiz e fallece privado*) admits only the translation 'all other things [beside God] are without roots and fail *quickly*' (not . . . 'easily' which would be an unartistic anticlimax).

PAZPUERCA 'fat, course woman,' s. v. *puerca* is unconvincingly explained as **faz-puerca* 'face of a sow' (with assimulation $f - p > p - p$). I would rather suggest a compound of the type *Mari-sabidilla, Mari-basura* containing the proper name *Paz* (cf. the Andalusian adage quoted by Correas, it is true, without indication of its meaning: "Buena es *Maripaz, que nos da tocino*"—*Maripaz* = name of a sow?). Thus *paz-puerca* would have to be analysed (*Mari-*)*Paz puerca*.

PULLA, REPULLÓN, REPULLAR. The new explanations by C. of the first of these words as a regressive formation from the second and of this by way of *repellere* with *-u-* from *repŭli repŭlsus* seem to me unconvincing. The O Cat. *sebollir* < *sepellire* with *-ŭ-* from *sepŭltus* offered as a parallel is an *-ir*, not an *-ar* verb like *repullar*; and Sp. *empellar* 'to push' that has replaced Lat. *impellere* (> *empellir*) by **impellare* does not show *-u-* forms, although the semantic affinity of *empellar* with *empujar* < **im-puls-are* (according to C. s. v. *empellón*) should have encouraged an **empullar*. Furthermore, it seems obvious, as Gillet in his commentary to Torres Naharro has implicitly suggested, that *pulla* can not be a regressive formation from the earlier attested *repullon*, given such old attestations as *una pulla con su repullon* which phrase I would translate 'a taunt with its counter-taunt.' And I also agree with Professor Gillet's suggestion that *repullon* may be "an augmentative of *repullo*" in an original meaning such as the one listed by the Academy dictionary 'arrow with hook or barb' (the *re-* indicating the idea 'curved backward'): thus *pulla* and *repullo* were originally 'barb and counter-barb' with the same semantic development as in the English word *barb*: obviously the concrete meaning must precede the abstract one (cf. also Fr. *pointe*). The meaning 'violent movement of the body, twitch' is, of course, connected with the arrow (a twitch as if caused by an arrow). As to *pulla*, the connection with *púa* 'thorn, tooth of a comb' proposed by Menéndez Pidal seems to me correct (the fact that *púa* is never attested in the meaning 'taunt' must not weigh too heavily: it is thanks to the humanistic interest in wit that *pulla* appears first in Nebrija). The phonetic difficulty of the *-ll-* may be solved in the manner C. himself has indicated s. v. *grulla* (< *gru*(*y*)*a*). In view of the verbs usually appearing with *pulla*: *echar, arrojar*, I would discard today my former idea that the etymon of *pulla* must be the same as that of Fr. (*dire, chanter*) *pouilles*.

QUERER 'to love.' On the semantic development of this verb cf. my forthcoming article in "Syntactica" (*Festschrift für Gamillscheg*).

QUISICOSA 'riddle.' The use by Nebrija, alternatively, of *e* and *y* in the introductory phrase of the riddle: *qués cosa e cosa—qué es cosa y cosa* has induced C. to assume it to be a borrowing from Ital. (*o*) *cos'è, cos'è*? 'what is it?'; but, apart from the fact that we do not know how old the shortening of It. *che cosa*? to *cosa*? is, the Sp. sentence *qué* (*e*)*s cosa y cosa*? would

present an Italian *cos'è* + a superimposed Span. *qué es*?—a highly improbable combination, and the parallel sentence *qué es y qué es?* would not be explained at all. And should one think that for one of the basic popular literary genres the Spaniards should have borrowed a name from Italian? The *e* in Nebrija's *qués cosa e cosa* may simply be the O Sp. *e*, maintained in a crystallized sentence.—I would not ascribe the repetition of *cosa* to the habit of reduplication in nursery rhymes, at least not in the original phase of the formula: in *qué es cosa y cosa?* and *qué es y qué es?* there is originally implied a double question since, generally, riddles present the object to be guessed with a paradoxical contrast of two features, as in the Catalan example quoted by C.:

> . . . per tot arreu se posa,
> i en el mar no grosa (= 'snow')

or in Couarrubias' example:

> la lança que cabe en el puño
> y no cabe en el arca.

Thus 'cosa + cosa' are equivalents of algebraic x + y (cf. It. *tal dei tali* where the first *tale* refers to the *x* of the first name, the second to the *y* of the family name) and the introductory line prepares the listener for that basic feature of the riddle, its paradoxical contrast.

RALEA. C. has proved that this word meant originally 'prey of a bird of prey,' then 'particular prey of such a bird,' then 'sort, class of things or beings' (the modern meaning). This and his suggestion of a Galloromance origin for this term of hunters is sound, but I am unable to agree with the particular Fr. word suggested: OF *ralée*, derived from the verb *raler* which might have become identical with *aler* (cf. *rentrer* = *entrer* [8]) and might have developed, in the language of hunters, the same meaning as the simplex *aler* ('to set upon the prey,' said of the falcon). "Hypothèse pour hypothèse," I would propose an (equally unattested) OF *ralie, raleie* 'rally,' postverbal noun from OF *ralier -eier* 'to rally,' cf. the modern semantic developments listed by FEW, s. v. *ligare* V, 326: "*rallie*! cri que l'on pousse pour arrêter les chiens," *rallier* 'arrêter les chiens et les ramener quand ils prennent le change'" (both attested 1794): *rallie*! could as well have been in OF a cry that brought the falcon back so as to launch it on a new prey (cf. the definition of Bluteau, quoted by C. 'a industria do caçador os [os falcões] inclina a outra caça,' i. e. the hunter trains the falcons to set upon other birds than those that are their favorite prey). Phonetically, cf. Sp. *alear* < OFr. *aleier, allier*.—As to the Port. adjective *réles* 'ordinary, vulgar,' instead of assuming a rather far-fetched blend of the noun *relé* = Sp. *ralea* and the adjective *rahez* in a Spanish (!) form (because the Port. form is *refez*), I would derive it from middle Fr. [1393] *relais* (pronounced *relés*) in the meaning 'ce qui est laissé, ce qui reste,' *terre de relais* 'jachère,' Norm. *de relais* 'à l'abandon' (God.; FEW, s. v. *laxare* V, 224): **terra de relés* 'abandoned land' could

[8] But the passage from Benoît's *Chronique* shows surely a *raler* in the meaning 'to go back' as is shown by the previous verse *Un jor refu levé* 'he rose again,' parallel to *rala en la forest chacier*.

become **terra relés* and then the stress was moulded on the adjectives *préstes, léstes* etc. (what 'remains behind' is somehow the opposite of 'what is ready at hand' and opposites may influence each other).

REACIO. Instead of C.'s very complicated theory (**re-fracidus*, with the second *r* disappearing by dissimilation, and with the semantic development 'rancid' > 'wrathful'), I would propose a postverbal adjective from an unattested verb **re-fazear* from 'faz' meaning either 'face' or 'cheek,' and with the *-ear* formation as in *cocear, cociar* from *coz*, the semantic development and the prefix being parallel to Lat. *recalcitrare*, Fr. *se rebéquer* 'tenir tête avec aigreur' (mentioned by C. s. v. *rebeco*).

RECIO > Lat. *rigidus*. C. explains the surprising *-c-* (*-z-* in the majority of the OSp. texts) by an influence of OSp. *refazio* 'wrathful' (mod. *reacio*, *v. supra*), but neither semantically ('wrathful' > 'robust, strong') nor rythmically (a word of the pattern ⏑ ′ ⏑ ⏑ influencing one of the pattern ′ ⏑ ⏑) do the two words seem likely to be associated. Perhaps one could think of an influence of *flaccidus* > Sp. *lacio*, which is the opposite of *rigidus* (in one Latin text listed by the ThLL *flaccescens* is indeed opposed to *rigens*); the *-cc-* (> OSp. *c*) of *flaccidus* would have acted on the *-g-* of *rigidus* (< OPort. *régeo*) so as to produce a middle value: *-z-* (OSp. > *rezio*, OPort. *rézeo*). If we should give importance to the few examples of *recio* with *-c-* in OSp. (v. Corominas), the influence of *lacio* on *rezio* would be complete (*z* > *c*).

REHILAR (popular pronunciation *rilar*) 'to tremble.' The idea of a Gothic *reiran* 'to tremble,' dissimilated to **rilan*, giving Sp. *rilar* and, then, being broken up into *re-hilar*, is overladen with improbabilities to a degree that should have prevented C. from even suggesting it. Why should a German verb of *this* kind be taken over by a Romance language? And the idea of the recomposition (based only on an equally unbelievable case: *regoldar* < from an unattested **roldar* < **cructulare*) must be immediately abandoned when one thinks of the greater likelihood of a development *reilar* > *rilar* than of the reverse. It is as little advisable to reject the obvious possibility of *rehilar* being a compound of *hilar* as it is to neglect the possible relationship of *repropio* (see below) with *propio*: it is, in either case, to reject *a limine* etymological relationships within the particular language: to ignore, in other words, the principle of the "étymologie indigène" advocated by Sainéan. I believe the original meaning of *rehilar* to be 'to trill, twitter, said of birds,' as this appears in the parallel Catalan *refilar* 'gorjear, trinar los pájaros' (which C. separates from our word family) and in Salamanca *rejiñol* (< **rehilón*) 'vasija . . . que produce un sonido semejante al gorjeo de los pájaros': **re-filare* in this meaning must be derived from *filum* > *hilo* 'blade of a knife' (> Sp. *hilo, filo de la navaja*), and means 'to sharpen, to refine, to make thin' (cf. Fr. *raffiler* in the same meaning). Now, thinking of such O. Provençal expressions as *afilar son | chan* (Appel, *Prov. Chrestom.* 32, 3: *no's taing c'om* son chant afil | *ab tan prima maestria* | *que no sia clars com dia*, 'to sharpen, refine one's song,' cf. also 7, 153: *sos reproverbis afilatz e forbitz*, 'refined and polished tales'), or *afinar son chan* 'to refine one's song,' said of birds by Jaufré Rudel ([quan] *'l rossignolez el ram | volf*

e refranh e aplana | *son doutz chan e afina*), we may assume a similar Sp. **rehilar el canto* 'to refine one's song [by way of trilling],' said of birds. From 'trilling of birds' there is an easy transfer to the humming and zooming of arrows traversing the air (one of the meanings of the Spanish verb, perhaps already occurring in a Lope passage), and from there we come to the technical term *rehilante* for *ž* coined by the phonetician Navarro Tomás. A further development is that from 'trilling' to 'trembling,' since trilling is accompanied by a trembling movement, cf. It. *trillare le ali* 'to shake' attested in Tomm.-Bellini. (The opposite transfer 'trembling' > 'trilling' is found in Engl. *quaver* and in O. Prov. *refrim* 'bird's song' < *frim* 'trembling' (*frémissement*).

Arag. REPROPIO, Cat. REPROPI 'recalcitrant, rebellious (said mainly of animals)' and the verb REPROPIARSE, s. v. *reproche*. Given this meaning which is never found with the word family *reproche, reprochar*, and also the Cat. form *repropri* (which C. must explain as 'hyper-correction': as though the word were a compound of *propi* < *propri*), I would venture to explain *reprop(r)iar-se* as 'to withdraw upon oneself, upon one's own' > 'to be recalcitrant' and offer as a parallel the German word-family *eigensinnig* 'obstinate,' lit. 'having one's own mind.' The explanation of the family *reproche reprochar* from **repropium* which would be a blend of *opprobrium* + *reprobatio* + *improperium*, though offered by C. as final, seems to me far from convincing. I should still side with Diez's **repropiare* (from *prope*) 'to bring sth. that had escaped the attention of sb. home, back, close, to him.' If C. finds it necessary to devote a whole paragraph to the praise of masters such as Schuchardt, Grammont, Jud who mastered the *whole* of the Latin word material, he might as well have praised Diez for the good sense which made him look at relationships obtaining *within* one Romance language, explaining *reproche(r)* from *proche*.

REYERTA. OSp. *refierta* 'reproach, retort, angry reply,' later 'dispute, altercation.' The excellent idea of relating this word to Lat. *referre* 'to answer, reply' (although OSp. *referir* in the meaning 'to beat back an enemy, a wolf, etc.' is no good proof: for this verb belongs to *ferire* in the Latin and OSp. meaning 'to strike') is marred by the attempt to construct a frequentative form **referitare* based on a hapax *feritare* attested in Solinus, 3rd cent. In that case one would, at least occasionally, expect an OSp. form **referdar* (along with *refertar*). It is strange that the Catalan scholar Corominas did not think of Cat. *referta* 'proverb' in J. Roig (cf. Aguiló), which proves the existence of a **refertum -a* substantive participle (instead of *relatum*) in another meaning ('that which is said'). But Romance shows other evidence of the *-fertum* participle: Fr. *offerte*, It. *offerta* (the Sp. *oferda* form does not prove an **offeritare*, as C. assumes s. v. *preferir*, only a blend of *oferta* + *ofrenda*); OProv. *proferta*, It. *profferta*, etc.

OSp. REGUNÇAR 'to announce, communicate,' s. v. *rezongar*. The explanation *renunçar* (< *renuntiare*) + *recontar* with *-c-* > *-g-* as in *regalar* (< **recalare*) seems unlikely in view precisely of the assumed phonetic change *-c-* > *-g-*: why should the *-c-* in the blend evolve a *-g-* variant which is not found in *recontar*? As to my own explanation **re-cognit-iare* rejected sternly

by C. ("nade vale," "síncopa imposible en cast.," "poco recomendable en el sentido morfológico y semántico"), I still can not see why the syncope **recogn(i)tiare* should not have taken place as it did in **ex-crep(i)t-iare* which C. himself, s. v. *quicio*, reconstructs for the OSp. noun *rescrieço*, i. e. a postverbal formation from a **rescreçar*. Morphologically, **ex-crepit-iare* is the same type of formation as *re-cognit-iare*. Semantically **re-cognitiare* 'to make known' > 'to announce' is exactly parallel to OF *percoindar* 'to make known' < **per-cognit-are* attested in the *Passion* of Clermont-Ferrand (OF *cointe* still sometimes preserves the old meaning 'known, familiar,' f. inst. in the *Alexius*). With this semantic archaism the phonetic development *-c-* > *-g-* is in harmony.

The Johns Hopkins University LEO SPITZER

Dorus aus Istrien: A Question Answered

This article is intended as a continuation and completion of my study, "*Dorus aus Istrien*: A Question of Identity" (*PMLA*, LXVIII (December, 1953), 1056-1067), in which the title work, a eulogistic pastoral by the Nürnberg poet-historian Sigmund von Birken, was investigated as to its authorship, the person to whom it was dedicated, and certain rather mysterious anagrams appearing within the work. On the basis of recent findings of MSS in the archives of the *Pegnesischer Blumenorden*, I am able to substantiate the theory proposed in the aforementioned article and to explain all questions left unanswered at the time.

Floridans hochbelobter Dorus aus Istrien[1] is quite simply one of the long series of encomia within the pastoral framework, which Birken wrote as a tribute to his many noble patrons. It would present no problems whatever, if it were not for the fact that the patron is unidentified and that certain stylistic features in the work are peculiar. The plot describes the finding of a scroll, containing a series of love lyrics, written by the noble "Dorus" to his wife "Elinda." Most of the work is devoted to songs of praise for this nobleman and his family. The mixed form, which presents laudatory poems within a prose framework is a stereotyped scheme, used frequently by the

[1] The work appeared in two separate editions, first independently, and, second, as a part of the collection of pastorals entitled: *Pegnesis: oder der Pegnitz Blumgenoss-Schäfere FeldGedichte in neun Tagzeiten . . .* (Nürnberg, 1672). This second edition is more complete, and page references cited are from this version.

Nürnberg poets in order to present a eulogy to a patron, but the whole device is obscured by the fact that the person to whom the work is directed is *not* mentioned, seemingly making it pointless and without purpose. One of the poems in the composition contains an anagram, "Kehrmannlichein," which refers to this patron, but he is not identified further. Otherwise anagrams refer to the locale and to other persons involved in the poetic fiction.

In the above mentioned article, I was able to establish Henrich Kielmann von Kielmansegg, an Austrian nobleman and patron of the arts, as the person to whom the work was directed (Henrich Kielmann = Kehrmannlichein), and to suggest that the involved fiction of the finding of the scroll might be interpreted as a real event here disguised by the pastoral overlay. A letter from Birken [2] to this patron described the sending of an unidentified "Lied" which Birken had written and requested the approval of Kielmansegg for this writing. If the suggestion be accepted that this plot be interpreted as a well masked actual occurrence, then several problems present themselves. Did Kielmann actually submit a series of poems to Birken to have published? The letter from Birken suggests not only this, but also that Kielmann might have wanted to have these poems published under Birken's name. This then leads to the suspicion that perhaps the work in question, *Dorus aus Istrien,* might itself be the collection of poems and that Birken might have been presenting the poems of his patron in the usual pastoral framework which he used for his own works. A stylistic analysis of the poems established that of the twenty-one poems included, eight were definitely Birken's, five were probably his, and eight could not be determined as to their authorship. In addition, the "Lied," of which Birken writes in his letter, presents a problem. Might it have referred also to *Dorus aus Istrien,* or, if not, to what does it refer? Moreover, what is the key to the remaining anagrams? And, finally, what attendant circumstances led to this rather peculiar state of affairs? These are the questions which this paper proposes to answer.

In the archives of the *Pegnesischer Blumenorden* is to be found a series of letters from Kielmansegg to Birken, in which the whole series of events unfolds, and, on the basis of these letters, we may reconstruct just what took place. There are nine letters from Kielmansegg, dated from Vienna, and extending from February 1, 1651,

[2] MS quotations are all cited with the permission accorded to members of the *Pegnesischer Blumenorden,* owners of the MSS.

to May 30, 1652, (2-36a to 2-36i)[3] as well as a letter from Johann Wilhelm von Stubenberg, Birken's close friend and patron, in which Birken's services to Kielmansegg are discussed in detail (6-2d).

With the first letter, dated February 1, 1651 (2-36a), Kielmann sends Birken fifty poems, and the request that Birken correct and stylize them for him and put them into the proper form, "dan ich hab nit studiert, sein natürliche einfehl . . ." [= sind natürliche Einfälle.] Kielmann claims that friends of his have insisted that he make arrangement for the publication of these poems (this is a common justification for publishing one's own works), and requests that Birken take care of this task through a Nürnberg publisher, and send him full information including the cost of some sixty copies. Although this seems presumptuous on Kielmann's part, it was not an uncommon practice of the day for a nobleman to make such requests of a prominent poet, and it was understood that remuneration in the form of money and/or the favor of the noble patron would be the reward.

Hence we may see a part of the proposed theory substantiated; namely, that the pastoral plot of *Dorus aus Istrien* did indeed mask a real event, and that Kielmann actually did submit poems for Birken to publish. The supposition that Kielmann might have wanted Birken to publish them under his, Birken's, name rested either on a misinterpretation or a careless reading by Birken of Kielmann's letter. In reality, Kielmann requested, ". . . nicht dz ichs für mich, sondern als wan der Herr solche zusammen gebracht und mir zu ehren in Truck zu verfassen ihme wer beigefallen . . ." i.e. Kielmann would like Birken to lend his name only to the edition and not to the poems themselves. But Birken replied: "Es wird aber, ungeacht ich meinen Nahmen darzuleihe gleichwohl erhellen, dass sie an der Donau und nicht an der Pegnitz gebohren seyen und man wird sie leichtlich vor nicht die meinen erkennen," apparently under the impression that Kielmann wanted him to claim the poems as his own. It must be said that Kielmann's style is so confused and involved, and the handwriting is so bad, that a misreading is easily possible.

The letter continues to the effect that more poems will be sent as soon as Kielmann has collected them from the various people to whom he has lent them. A very long postscript clears up several other puzzling matters. It begins: "Auf beikommende frantzoische Arie

[3] Catalogue numbers refer to the author's own listing of MSS in the archives. The system of cataloguing as well as a critical bibliography of the archives will be given in a forthcoming monograph.

wird ein Lied von mir gesucht, die Materia soll sein . . ." and here follows the "plot" of the entire "Kehrmannlichein" poem which appears in *Dorus aus Istrien*. He continues: "NB der Patron des Schloss haisst Wentzl Heggenmüler, dz Schloss aber Albrechtsberg, dz Wasser die Pillach wie nun solches zusamen zusetzen. Und ihme den Nahm Wentzlidor oder was dem Herrn beifallen mogte, kann gegeben werden. Kehrmanlich, dz bin ich, und ist mein Ubersetzter nahm dem Herrn alles an hainib gesteldt."

In Birken's reply we find the lines: "Hierbey komet ein Lied, zwar auf E. G. Befehl, aber vielleicht nicht nach dero Wünsch verfärtigt." This "Lied" was the object of much speculation and led even to the possible suspicion that the title work itself might have been referred to. If that had been the case, then the poems within the work would have been suspect, and, for this reason, the poems were investigated as to authorship. However, with Kielmann's letter in our possession, we may see clearly that he is referring rather to the Kehrmannlichein poem, which Kielmann had requested from Birken in order, we may conclude, to honor a certain host of Kielmann. We may say "host" since "Wentzl Heggenmüler" is mentioned as the "Patron" of the castle Albrechtsberg (near Melk in Lower Austria), and we may assume that Kielmann somehow felt endebted to him and wanted to do him honor. Hence he has requested the "Lied" from Birken and has specified the contents; namely, that an old shepherd, Kehrmannlichein, has wandered into this picturesque vicinity and was well received and "woll tractirt" by the castle's owner. This postscript also clears up the other anagrams in the Kehrmannlichein poem. In the third stanza, we find the castle identified as the "Prachtelberg," which is, of course, the anagram for "Albrecht(s)berg," and the river called the "Lilpach," an anagram for "Pillach" (= Pielach). With a touch of tongue-in-cheek irony, the noble lord of the castle is called "Lenzenheckenwurm" which must be the anagram for "Wenzl Heckenmuler," although one "l" is not employed in the rearrangement.

In the second letter from Kielmansegg, dated February 23, 1651 (2-36b), Kielmann approves the "Lied" and offers a few suggestions which he would like to have included in it. He even proposes one strophe as follows:

> **Unter floß in Vfern Schöne**
> **Lilpach ein flutreicher bach**
> **der mit lallen angenehmer**
> **endet neben seiner Mutter Pracht.**

This Birken judiciously changed to the following:

> **Unten floß in Ufern schöne**
> **Lilbach eine starke Bach/**
> **die mit sußem Fallgethöne**
> **rauschte Felsen-ab gemach.**

We may see in Kielmann's version the awkwardness and crudity of his verses, and in Birken's revision, the improvement as well as the technique of polishing the rough edges while preserving essentially what his patron has written.

In succeeding letters we find more details of the transaction. Birken suggests that the work might be dedicated to Kielmann's wife and this suggestion is approved with enthusiasm. Moreover, Birken offers to write a " Schäfferey " to provide an introduction to the work. This *Schäfferey* must be our work in question, *Dorus aus Istrien*, and we may assume that it was indeed used as an introduction to Kielmann's collection of poems. When it is submitted, Kielmann accepts it with thanks and makes further requests for other poems honoring various persons and events. In a description of himself and his wife and children, Kielmann fills in the missing and contradictory details which occur in the various biographies;[4] He writes: ". . . wir haben durch den segen Gottes 9. Kinder miteinander erzeugt die Leben, dem höchsten sei danck nach allen als 7. Knaben und 2. Magdlin." (2-36e). This corresponds to the details given in *Dorus aus Istrien.*

The final letter from Kielmann is dated May 30, 1652 (2-36i) and is written some nine months after the preceding one. Kielmann tells Birken that he has not written because he has been visiting his " Herrschaft Gfohl " in an effort to recover his failing health, but he is still confined to his bed. He sends Birken six *Ducaten* as payment for his services and urges that the correspondence between them be continued. Apparently, however, in the remaining years to 1659, when Kielmann died at the age of seventy-three, there were no further dealings between them.

Birken was evidently not too enthusiastic about the amount of work which the whole project demanded of him. We see evidence in several letters that the total number of poems submitted for correction was over two hundred. Hence, Birken must have written a letter complaining of the matter to his friend and patron, Johann Wilhelm von

[4] Cf. the article in PMLA for details. In three different sources the number of Kielmann's children from his second wife is reported as nine, eight and two.

Stubenberg, whose reply illustrates his attitude to Kielmann as well as to Birken: "Des H: vielfältige beunmüssigungen, kann Ich mir leichtlich ein bilden, u. wäre doch ohne dessen belässtigung von allen deutschen billichst zuwündschen, daß der Herr Mathusalems Altter überreichte, und seine goldene Feder keinen augenblikk feÿren liesse. Allein betraure Ich von herzen das selbige in beschmükkung einer so schlechten Krähe alß des Kielmanns Lieder seÿn (mitt denen unser Ister wenig zu prangen) soll die teure Zeitt verlieren. Dieser Kielmann ist aus einem verdorbenen Kaufmann Landschafft-einnehmer worden, da Er dann . . . soviel erkrazzt, daß Er ein Edelmann u. Landmann worden; hatt eine Unverzagtin (dero Anherr ein Trompetter gewesen, der Vatter aber alß ein grosser Finanzer Kaÿsl: Hofkammerpresident oder Vorsteher u. Freÿherr) geheurahtet." (Letter dated, Schallaburg, d. 3. Wintermonats, 1651. 6-2d).

Reconstructing the entire situation, we may see just what happened. Kielmann had written a series of poems, which he wanted to see in print. Having heard of Birken's reputation, he wrote to him with the request that Birken take care of the printing and revise his poems to suit the literary mode of the day. In addition, he requested a poem which was to honor his friend, Wentzl Heggenmüler, who had recently entertained him in his castle. Birken agreed to the commission and also produced the requested poem, which, after revision, presumably served its purpose. We have no record of a collection of poems by Kielmann, but in view of the limited number of copies intended, and the poor quality of the poems themselves, in spite of Birken's revision, it is not surprising that no copies may have survived. Since payment was made, it seems certain that the book did appear. Birken, doubtless in an effort to be as obliging as possible, also offered to write a "Schäfferey" to serve as the introduction to the book. In accordance with Birken's general procedure, the *Schäfferey*, although serving its purpose as an introduction for Kielmann, was reprinted in its entirety by Birken, first as an independent work, and then as a part of the collection of such works, *Pegnesis*. As it appears in its final version, it seems to have little purpose, since it does not name the patron whom it honors, but it had already accomplished this end, when it appeared with Kielmann's poems, and the reprinting now brings it before a larger public than the private edition would have done, hence affording Birken an opportunity to give a wider circulation to his poems.

University of California,
Berkeley, California

BLAKE LEE SPAHR

The 1583 Low-German Version of *Grobianus Tischzucht*

The last phase of the development of mediaeval German etiquette literature is precisely what one would expect. Just as *Minnesang* declined into *Meistergesang,* and the ingenious tales of Stricker sank to the level of the Schwank, simiarly the literature of etiquette, from its originally high level of treatment by Thomasin, Tannhäuser, et al., degenerated into grobianism.[1] In their own ways, Wittenweiler, Sebastian Brant and Hans Sachs helped matters along, but the apogee of the development was reached by Friedrich Dedekind in his Latin *Grobianus* (later *Grobianus et Grobiana*), which was translated into German by Caspar Scheidt.[2]

The success of the *Grobianus* was tremendous, both in Germany and abroad, the last translation being into English in 1739 with a dedication to Dean Swift. Independently of Dedekind there appeared in 1538 in High German a little tract in the form of a bull which began *Grobianus Tischzucht bin ich genant, Den Brüdern im Sew orden wol bekant* (Dt. Staatsbibliothek Yz 3301). We shall designate this text as *A*. It was, to the best of my knowledge, never reprinted and is now not likely to be since the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek has informed me that the unique copy has been lost since the end of the Second World War.

Two Low-German translations of this text were however made:

B—Grobianus Dischtücht bÿ̆n ÿck genant. Den brůdren ÿm sw̃ orden wol bekant. (Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel 257.14 Theol.) No date.

C—Grauianus vnd Grauiana etc. (Also Wolfenbüttel 177.2 Poet.) Dated 1583.[3]

I have printed all pertinent excerpts from *B* in the collection of texts noted in Footnote 1; the text of *C* is printed below.

Although *B* is undated, I believe that it is considerably older than *C,* and probably not much younger than *A,* due to the language, the generally poor nature of the translation, and the quality of print in *B.*

[1] For a detailed discussion and examples, see Schirokauer-Thornton, *Höfische Tischzuchten* and *Grobianische Tischzuchten,* Vols. 4 and 5 respectively, of *Texte des späten Mittelalters* (Berlin, 1957).

[2] The Latin poem (1549) was edited by A. Bömer (*Lat. Litteraturdenkmäler des XV und XVI Jhs.,* Berlin 1903), and German version (1551) by Gustav Milchsack (*Neudrucke dt. Litteraturwerke des XVI u. XVII Jhs.* No. 34-35, Halle/S. 1882).

[3] I have procured and have available for inspection photostats of both texts.

Without having *A* as a basis of comparison, it cannot be determined with certainty whether the editor of *C* based his version on *B* or translated directly from *A*. Due to the considerable similarity in wording between *B* and *C* however, I am inclined to the former view. Actually, the only major differences between *B* and *C* are improvements in the intelligibility of *C* and interpolations at the beginning and end of *C*. It is these interpolations to which we shall now turn our attention.

Between the appearance of *A* and *C*, and perhaps even between *B* and *C*, the Latin and German versions of Dedekinds *Grobianus* appeared. The effect of this poem was considerable, and a work so similar as *Grobianus Tischzucht* could not but be influenced by the more popular poem. Consequently, the editor of *C* found it advisable to allow his modest tract to bask in the glory of the better known poem. Indeed, he took almost verbatim as the inscription for his title page the opening lines of Wendelin Hallbach's revision of Scheidt's translation which was first printed in 1567,[4] and below the woodcut inserted the rhyme:

Liss wol dith Bőkelin offt vnd veel / Vnd do alltydt dat wedderspeel.

which had appeared on all German versions of the *Grobianus*. With an eye to prospective purchasers who might look beyond the title page, he then inserted a makeshift Low-German translation of the poem *An den Leser* which likewise was a traditional part of the German *Grobianus*.

In two more places minor changes were made, namely at the end of the introductory passage before Chapter I, and at the close of Chapter XVI. In the former instance, the sole purpose of the change seems to have been to allow the name Grobianus to appear, which was not present in *B*. At the end, the change consists only in the expansion of the register of names, the addition of the publication date, and the omission of a short pious verse. In the body of the text the changes are not substantive.

Thus, although the High-German original of this tract is lost, we nevertheless can get a good idea of its content from the translation printed below (and of course from the text of *B*). Equally interesting is the little fraud which the editor attempted to perpetrate by pirating the trademarks of the *Grobianus*. Since only one copy of *C* has come down to us, it would seem that even in the 16th century dishonesty found its own punishment.

[4] See Milchsack, *op. cit.*, p. xxvi ff.

Blatt Ir

Grauianus vnd Grauiana

Van vntůchtigen / grauen / vnhöuischen Seden / vnd Bůrischen geberden

(Holzschnitt)

Liss wol dith Bökelin offt vnd veel /
Vnd do alltydt dat wedderspeel.

Blatt Iv

An den Leser

Idt ys ein Oldt gewånlick sitt /
Wat men gebůth / dat höldt men nicht
Des gliken wat men hoch vorbůth /
Wo böss ydt sy / so dondt de Lůd.
Denn wo men Döget leren schal /
Synt olde vnd nye Böker vull.
Hebben nicht Syrach vnd Salomon /
Veel schöne gude Lehr gedån?
So hebben Plato vnd Seneca
Gemåckt veel schöne *Opera*.
Cicero / Aristoteles /
Hebben sick ock sehr beflytet des.
Erasmus hefft gelert darby /
Wo sick tůchtich tho holden sy.
Vnd wern der Böker noch so veel /
So deith men doch dat wedderspeel.
Vnd wil nemandt neen Döget lern /
So wil ickt achterste vör kern.
Vnd vort ein ander Form beschriuen /
Wo men schal graue Sede dryuen.
Bůrisch / vnfledich syn vnd groff /
Dat ick ein mål de Laster låff.
Wil Tucht / Schåm vnd Döget schelden /
Vnd sehen welcker mehr wil gelden.
Hebb gy nu alltydt vnderlan /
Wat wyse Lůd gebaden han /
So doth ock nicht wat ick gebed /
So werde gy erst tůchtig Lůd.
Dith ys ein nye Fantasy /
Liss frölick / vnd gedenck darby /
Wat dy tho dond vnd laten sy.

Blatt IIr

Den vnfledigen / grauen vnd vnhöuischen / synen leuen Schölern vnd angenamen Kindern / wůnschet Meister Grauian vam Narrenberge / veel vnförmlike Sede vnd tůlpische Geberde.

Kundt vnd apenbar sy allen vnd ydermennichlick / in wat Werden / Wesende vnd Stande se syn / Dat ick M. Grauianus vam Narrenberge / mit weten / rade vnd willen myner alderleuesten / tzarten vnd dögetsamen Hussfrouwen

Grauiana / vele vam Adel / Presterschöppe / Ordens Lûden / Mönnicken / Nunnen / Beginen / Koeplûden / Bôrgern / Handtwerkern / Buren / vnd Geschlechte aller Stende / ein nye Bröderschop angefangen vnd gefundert hebbe / nicht mit weinigem Afflate / des Geldes vorsettinge / vorpandinge / ligende vnd varende Gûder / reformert vnd bestediget ys / Vnd gemeinlick alle disse vôrbenômede Ordens Lûde / neen schimlich Geldt / schimlich Brodt / garsterich Speck / noch Rente edder Tinse auer beholden / Wowol in sôlcken Orden / synt etlike olde Bröders dat schwerlick by tho bringende / nicht tho min / de Jungen syn dartho gantz willich tho prôuende. Darûmme hebbe ick allen Brödern vnd (Blatt IIᵛ) Sûstern / disses Ordens tho guder vorbeteringe eres willens / etlike Artikele vnd Puncte hyruth getekent / vp dat se desûluigen vaken lesen / vnd de ôuinge disses Ordens deste flytiger tho Herten nemen vñ inbilden / besundern de / welckere van rechter Tucht / Ehre vnd Ehrbarheit affscheiden / vnd vor erem Ende ehr tho Armode / alse tho Ehren vnd Rykedagen kamen mögen / Vnd in disser klenen Vormaninge / können alle leuen Sûsters vnd Bröders / mynen gantz flytigen willen disses Ordens vornemen. Darmit disse vnse löffiike Geselschop gemehret / darneuen alle Döget / Tucht / schâm vnd meticheit / wo schon (loff sy *Baccho*) thom dele gescheen / gantz vthgerottet vnd vordelget wert.

Bin derhaluen guder hôpeninge / gy werden dith klene Geschencke / yegen my Olden / schwacken vnd trûwen Meister erkennen / vnd vp juwe Nakömlinge vnd alle Grauianer kamen laten / so wil ick mynen gâr olden Namen Grauianum / vp juw alle Eruen vnd blyuen laten / darmit mynes Stammes vñ Namens by juw / in allen grauen Stûcken gedacht werde. Gegeuen thom Narrenberge / am Dage des Beermâns / eine stunde na Middernacht / wenn de Doren vnd Gecke gemeinlick er gröteste Regiment holden / Im Jare myner Meisterschop ane Tall.

Juwe trûwe Vader vnd Meister Grauianus.

Blatt IIIʳ

Dat Erste Capittel.

So men hefft des Nachtes geseten beth tho einem effte twen schlegen / vnd denne tho Bedde geghan / vnd geschlapen beth tho negen affte tein schlegen / darna vpgestân mith Vedderigen Haren vnd vngewaschen Henden / nicht veel na der Kercken vmme gesehen / men vort tho dem Barnewyne vñ gudem Beere gelopen / frölick ein halff edder heel gedruncken / so lange dat men wedder in de vûlle kûmpt / vnd gesapen beth tho eluen schlegen / nemande nicht veel gudes na gesecht / So dy yemandt darûmme straffede / segge nein daruôr / ydt sy by den groten Drûncken gescheen / datsûluige ehret dy gantz wol / du kanst hyrmit deste ehr thom ende dynes Geldes vñ Gudes kamen.

Dat Ander Capittel.

Wenn ydt Middach ys / so frage du fiytich / wor de beste Kost beredet sy / so dy de Werdt nicht gebeden hefft / effte sûs dy vngern sûth / achte nicht / men alse ein Gast / vñ vngeheten sette dy bauen an vp de besten stede / mit vngewoschen (Blatt IIIᵛ) Henden / vnd sehe jo wol tho / dat dyne Negel lanck vnd swart synt / vnd jo dyne stede wol vorwarest: So dar Predicanten edder Ehrbare Lûde kamen / wyke nicht / beth de Tafel vull wert / Wenn men denn de Kost bringet / so sûme nicht lange / vnd gryp jo balde in dat Vath / So

dat beste stůcke nicht vor dy licht / alsedeñ machstu dat Vath wol vmme wenden / effte vor einen andern grypen / vnd vele ethen / des dõruestu dy nicht schemen / Is dat Flesch effte de Kost vett / so machstu wol einen Vinger na dem andern in de Mundt steken vnd afflicken / Weñ dy denn drinckens nodt ys / vnd du den Munde vull Spyse heffst / so schaltu de eine Backe vull holden vnd drincken / so dy denn Veth effte Kromen vth dem Munde in de Kanne effte Glas valt / dat steith gantz wol / vñ maket ander Lůde na dy gern tho drinckende. Du schalt ock nicht vphõren tho drincken / beth dy de Athem tho kort wert / vñ de Ogen vull Waters stån / vnd de Kanne leddich ys. Du schalt ock dat Wordt alle tydt allene hebben / darby kendt men dyne geschicklicheit.

Dat Drůdde Capittel.
(Blatt IVr)

So Grapenbrade / Hekede / Brasseme / edder ander thogemakede Spyse / mit Peper / swart effte geel vp de Tafel kůmpt / vnd wol schmecken wůrde / so schicke dy dartho / dat du hebbest einen groten schnede Brodes / dar du mõgest veer edder vyff mål aff byten / vnd stedes wedder in dat Vath stippen / vnd schalt jo den Mundt nůmmer leddich maken / dat leth sehr wol.

Dat Veerde Capittel.

Wenn ydt kůmpt vp einen Vischdach / vñ dy võr gesettet werden gesaden weke Eyer / so legge ein vor dy / vnd make ydt tho ethende bereidt / darna schnydt dyn Brodt nicht tho klein / dat du mõgest van einem beten vaken byten / vnd stippe alle tydt wedder in dat Ey / vnd vare thom lesten mit dem Nagel des Dumen rundt vmme her / effte licke ydt mit der Tungen reine vth / vnd so dy wat an dem Munde edder vor der Borst behangende blifft / des darffstu dy nicht schemen / sunder lath ydt fry sitten / dat men ydt sehen mõge.

Dat Voffte Capittel.
(Blatt IVv)

So dy Lass / Negenogen / Quappen / Stõr / Karpen / Schlye / edder ander grote Vische gesaden effte gebacken / vp de Tafel võrgesettet werden / desůluen schaltu balde tellen / vnd ock de Personen de vmme der Tafeln sitten / synt denn dar etlike stůcke auer / so nim alle tydt thom ersten ein klein stůcke / dat du balde vp ethen kanst / vnd denne na dem grõtesten stůcke in dat Vath gegrepen / datsůluige machstu mit ehren ock vp ethen / vnd sehe jo wol tho / dat du alle tydt den Kop van der Karpen / dat ander stůcke vam Hekede / vnd vam Schlye den Kop effte Stert vp dyn Tellõr bringest / so ydt nicht vor dy licht / so schaltu dat Vath vmme keren / edder vor einen andern grypen / Vnd nůmmer vorgeten / mit beiden Henden vnd Armen vp der Tafeln liggen / ock schaltu jo alle tydt twyer Minschen ruhm besitten / vnd klouwen dy vaken achter den Ohren / edder vp andern steden / dat steith går wol.

Dat Sõste Capittel.

Wenn Grůndelinge / Sturen / edder ander Vische / disser geliken / vp de Tafel kamen / so schaltu dyner er-(Blatt Vr)-sten gewånheit nicht vorgeten / vnd jo de erste im Vate syst / also / dat du alle tydt na dem grõtesten stůcke grypest / edder sůs twe edder dre thosamende nemest / vnd de Kõppe vnd Sterte affgereten / vnd thů denne den Visch mit den Graden dõrch den Mundt /

synt se ŏuerst gantz klein / so schnydt einen schnede Brodes / vñ schůppe dar der Vische genoech vp / so dy de Jůche twischen de Vinger dŏrch flůth / dat schadet nicht / vnd so du dat vp ein mål in de Mundt nicht bringen kanst / so schaltu dar eins edder twemål van byten / Vnd so dy yemandt secht / dat ydt klene Vische syn / so sprick ya / du nemest erer deste mehr thosamen vp dat Brodt / ec.

Dat Sŏuende Capittel.

So dy gebacken effte gesaden Ål vp de Tafel vŏr kůmpt / ys he vp Speten / so schaltu dar dre edder veer stůcke afftehen / beth dy ein geuelt / datsůlue tehe kume halff aff / vnd byth edder schnydt ydt wor ydt dy gelůstet / vnd nim balde ein ander stůcke: Is he denn in geler edder swarter Jůchen gesaden / so bistu vŏrhen berichtet / wo du en deñ langen schalt / dat schaltu nicht (Blatt V^{v}) reine vp ethen / ock de Graden vp dyn Tellŏr nicht leggen / sunder lath se halff daruan hangen / darna wedder in dat Vath gelecht / vnd alle tydt vor dynem Naber / so bistu dar nicht gewest / vnd leth mechtich wol.

Dat Achte Capittel.

Wenn dy geel Flesch effte Vische vp de Tafel vŏr kamen / vñ bauen mit Rosynen / Mandelen effte Corinten auer gestrouwet weren / vnd du se mit dem Meste nicht balde vplesen kŏndest / so schnydt einen groten schnede Brodes / vnd vare darmit auer der Kost rundt vmme her / make ein gudt Vŏder / so ydt dy vor dem Munde halff affualt / vnd nicht går inghan wil / dat machstu wol neuen dem Brode mit einem Vinger insteken vnd schlukent vp / wenn dy denn dyn Hals tho enge wert / edder eine rŏde vnder den Ogen thogheit / dat ys wol gedån.

Dat Negende Capittel.

So dy gesaden Kreuete effte Krabben vp de Tafel kamen / vnd dat Vath nicht na dynem geualle steith / so (Blatt VI^{r}) schaltu mit der Handt vor einen andern tasten / vnd eine gude Handt vull vthlesen / vnd de Sterte vnd Kreuete vp ethen / de Scheren machstu wol in de Tasche steken / dat leth vor den Lůden wol.

Dat Teinde Capittel.

Wenn gebraden Vische vp de Tafel kamen / de inwendich gefůllet weren / dar wes jo mit dem ersten by / vnd achte nicht / yfft dar Predicanten edder ander Erbare Lůde vmme her sitten / de ŏlder synt alse du bist / vnd nim den grŏtesten by dem Koppe / vnd besehe wat he im Buke hefft / vnd wat vp dyn Tellŏr kůmpt / dat eth jo rein vp / vnd giff nemandt wat daruan / dat wert dy by den Lůden groth loff geuen.

Dat Elffte Capittel.

So men eine Brade vp de Tafel bringet / de schaltu halff vor dy leggen / vnd rein vp ethen / dyne Munde wische nicht / vnd wor de grŏteste Beker vp der Tafeln steith / densůluen drinck rein vth / vnd so he dy in einem Athem tho lanck werden wil / so schaltu dyn schluck stille holden (Blatt VI^{v}) vnd Athem halen / ock schaltu alle tydt mit dynem Supende dryerley wyse holden / De Erste / Weñ dy de Ogen vull Waters stån. De Ander / Wenn dy de Athem tho kort ys. De Drůdde / So dar nicht mehr in der Kannen effte Glase ys /

alse vôrhen im Andern Capittel vormeidet / noch ein thosatt / der de Brôder im Suworden / mercklick ansichtich vnd bekandt / ock gantz angeneme maket / Hinder sick / alse de Buren de Spete dragen. Vnd so du (alse thouörn gemeldet) disse dre Teken vnd Regeln im drinckende hôlst / vnd dy na sôlckem drinckende etwes im Halse vpsticht / den spye auer de Tafeln / alse eine Fust groth / du dôruest en ock nicht vthtreden / So du ock dyne Nabers ein weinich darmede besprengest / dar licht nene macht an. Were ydt ock sake / dat dy dyne Nese drůppede / effte sůs (alse de Brôder gemeinlick syn) schnôuisch werest / so schnuff dy in dat Dischlaken / vnd tehe dat Vell van den Ogen / daruan werstu dyner tůchtigen reinicheit haluen / van Frouwen vñ Junckfrouwen / so de yegenwardich syn / gantz sehr vnd mercklick in eren Herten heimlick geleuet / im guden dyner van en gedacht / wo Pilatus im Credo.

(Blatt VII^r)

Dat Twölffte Capittel.

Du schalt ock mit allem flyte mercken / weñ Eyerkese / Wyndruuen / Appele / Beren / Nöte / effte Castannien / na gelegenheit der tydt / vp den Disch kamen / dat du jo einen guden Rusch hebbest / vnd ein weinich anheuest tho singende / (alse du wol kanst) dat schadet nicht : Ock schnydt ein groth stůcke midden vth dem Kese / vnd Botter dar bauen vp / alsedenn rame des Mundes / vnd byth dar jo gude grote stůcke van. Du dôruest de Appel vnd Beren ock nicht schellen / Ock schaltu de Nöte mit den Tēnen vp byten / du möchtest anders de spitze van dem Meste thobreken / de Schellen schaltu alle tydt vor dynen negesten Naber vnuormercket leggen: Also machstu ock dohn mit den Vischgraden vnd andern dingen / welckere dy nicht denen. Hebbe ock acht / dat ein ander dyn Tellôr vor dy vpneme / wenn de Måltydt gescheen ys / darby sůth men dyne Dischtucht gantz wol.

Dat Dôrteinde Capittel.

Wenn men dat Tafellaken vpnemen wil / so du denn dat vor dy vp—(Blatt VII^v)—schleist / vnd dyn Tellör wedder vp den bloten Disch lechst / edder an dem Tafellaken wisschest / dat leth fyn. Ock de Tēnen mit dem meste stakest / vnd mit der Tungen in beiden Backen rundt vmmeher varest / vnd denne den Suwtroch vull Beres fůllest / vñ datsůlue mit dem Athem dörch de Tēnen edder Tůlpelmôle vth vnd in sugest / wenn men denn dat van dy hôrt vnd sůth / so wert dy veel tucht vnd ehr nagesecht / Wente dat ys der vij. Dôgede eine.

Dat Veerteinde Capittel.

So men ein Becken mit Water vp de Tafel settet / de Hende na der Måltydt tho waschende / vnd datsůluige nicht vor dy queme / men vor Predicanten edder ander Erbare Lůde / de mehr wůrden geachtet alse du / so růcke dat Becken flucks vor dy / vnd wasche de Hende lange genoch / darna mith den natten Henden vnder de Ogen gewischet / vnd mit den Vingern de Nese rein gemaket / so dar ein stůcke geel edder swart Ertze na volget / ys tantz lustich den Bysittern anthosehende / dath einem ydern dat Herte im Lyue mô(gest vm)mekeren.

(Blatt VIII^r)

Dat Vôffteinde Capittel.

Wenn de Tafel vmmeher rein gemaket ys / vnd de Geselschop gern mit ehrliken tůchtigen reden na dem *Gratias* sick frŏlick maken wolde / so sehe jo wol tho / dat du alle tydt dat Wordt allene holdest / so dar einer wat in redet / dat lath dy nicht erren / Kanstu yemande by der Tafeln beschimpen / edder an syne Ehre reden / dat schaltu nicht laten / wente dat maket dy deste weiniger Frůnde / vnd im Orden wert ock veel mehr van dy geholden.

Dat Sŏsteinde Capittel.

So balde als de Måltydt gescheen ys / schaltu eine stunde schlapen / vnd deñ dŏrch alle Straten geghan / vnd mit flyte gehorcket / wor de beste Geselschop vp den Auendt syn wert / dar gha in / vnd sette dy nedder / vñ make kundtschop mit alle Man / vp dat dy genoech tho drinckende werde / Weñ dy deñ etlike thodrincken / so schaltu nemande schencken / besunder rein vthsupen / dat gifft dy nenen schaden / du werst deste ehr vull / deñ schaltu stille besitten blyuen / vnd beflytige dy / dat nemandt vor dynem ropende / singende vñ springende ein wordt hŏren kŏnne / Hebbe ock acht / wor twe edder etlike wat heimlikes mit einander thohope reden / dat du dyne Ohren spitzest / vnd flytich thohŏrest / du machst ock wol ein weinich darin seggen / des heffstu grote ehr. Wenn du denn wult edder kanst tho Huss ghan / so beflyte dy / dat du midden vp der Straten blyuest / dar de Dreck am depesten licht / dar vall hen in / du mŏchtest anders de Hůser vmme vallen / Darna make (Blatt VIII[v]) sŏlck ein rumor / dat alle Nabers wach werden / Wenn dy denn einer erwes darin sede / edder straffen wůrde / so schaltu em mit bŏsen wŏrden beyegen / so denn erer etlike thohope kamen / vnd dy dyne Hår wat kemmen / dat dy de Hals krum wert / so gha tho Huss vnd schlap / dat du deste ehr wedder tho andern ehrliken Geselschŏppen geladen werdest / vnd bauen an gesettet / negest der Dŏr / dar men in den Swynestall gheit. Ock so schicke dyn dinck / dat du de liggende Grůnde vnd stånde Erue / welckere dy van dynen Oldern synt geeruet / desůluigen vorkŏpe / effte vorsette se / vnd lŏse de nůmmer wedder / men yage ydt all dŏrch den Hals / den Acker darmede tho důngen / Vnd balde darna / mit einem vmme eine Handt vull Lůse eine Mummenschantze geworpen / ec. Wol nu an disser Bullen twyuelde / de mach *Grauianus* den Abbet / Swatdum den Supprior / Broder Vnflath / vnd Clawes Seldenryck Gastmeister / effte etlike Doctores disse Ordens / de in negen Jaren ny nůchtern weren / nŏmlick / Doctor Vullman / Beerschluck / Spyhardus / Eselbertus vnd Taleke Vnlustes / Her Wessel Seldennůchtern / *Anthonius* Drinckgern / Jochim Suputh / Tyes Freteueel / *Thomas* Důnnetasche / anspreken / desůluen wol eruaren disses Ordens / werden en vngetwyuelt berichten / nůmmermehr tho Ehren tho kamen / Sunder syn leuendtlanck mit der Sŏgen vp dem Messe gelegen / vnd in Armodt / vnlust / stanck / groth voracht / schmaheit / yamerlick syn Leuendt enden. Godt de Allmechtige / straffe sŏlcke vnd mehr Sůnde hyr / vnd schone dort / Amen.

Gedrůcket im Jare / 1583.

The John Hopkins University THOMAS PERRY THORNTON

Quirin Kuhlmann: The Jena Years

Recent investigations of Quirin Kuhlman's life and works have brought to light many new facts and perspectives [1] which should ultimately contribute to a thorough biography and a revaluation of his place in Seventeenth Century Baroque literature. In the archives of the *Pegnesischer Blumenorden* in Nürnberg are several documents [2] which throw further light on Kuhlmann's period of study at the University of Jena, where he spent the years from September 1670 to August 1673. Very little is known of this period of his life, although numerous legends, stemming mostly from his enemies, and conflicting scholarly suppositions exist. The order of his works written there has not been determined, and his activities and personality as a student have not been described.

During this period one of the recognized leading literary lights was the Nürnberg encomiastic poet-historian and head of the *Pegnesischer Blumenorden*, Sigmund von Birken. In his capacity of director of the Nürnberg literary society, which, during the waning period of the *Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft*, had gained steadily in influence, and as an important member of the Weimar literary group, Birken was virtually overwhelmed by tentative approaches for aid and advice by numerous hopeful young poets. Birken showed himself cooperative and helpful, contributing eulogies to the works of the petitioners, reading their manuscripts critically, and giving advice. One would certainly not expect this prominent literary figure to make advances and show favor to a young unknown, whose one claim to eminence was a single slim volume of poems and a eulogy to the *Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft*, delivered in his school at Breslau. Yet this seems to be precisely what happened. We find in a letter from Joachim Heinrich Hagen, a fellow student of Kuhlmann in Jena and the "Philadon" of the *Pegnesischer Blumenorden*, that Birken had instructed him to present Kuhlmann with a copy of his *Todesgedanken und Todtenan-*

[1] Cf. Curt von Faber du Faur, "Die Keimzelle des Kühlpsalters," *JEGPh*, XLVI (April 1947), 150-163; and, especially, the recent articles by Robert L. Beare, "Quirinus Kuhlmann: The Religious Apprenticeship," (= RA), *PMLA*, LXVIII (September 1953), 828-862; "Quirinus Kuhlmann. Ein Bibliographischer Versuch," (= BV), *La Nouvelle Clio*, VI (March-April 1954), 164-182; and, "Quirinus Kuhlmann and the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft," (= FG), *JEGPh*, LII (July 1953), 346-371.

[2] All MS material, which is published here for the first time, appears with the permission implicit in membership in the *Pegnesischer Blumenorden*, which was kindly conferred upon the author in 1953.

dencken, and that he has carried out Birken's instructions and has thereby struck up with Kuhlmann "eine annehmliche bekandschafft" (letter dated, January 6, 1671, 49-31j).[3]

It is not known why Birken would have taken the initiative in a matter such as this, but it is probable that he somehow saw Kuhlmann's *Entsprossende Teutsche Palmen*,[4] in which the young man had praised Birken in the most extravagant terms. Hence it would have been a polite gesture of acknowledgment to have sent the young man his latest work in appreciation for these compliments.[5] As a return gesture, with possible other implications, Kuhlmann dedicated the second edition of his *Unsterbliche Sterblikeit* to Birken among others.

There are present in the archives three letters from Kuhlmann to Birken,[6] in the first of which (dated January 10, 1671, 2-51a), we find the profuse thanks of Kuhlmann for the favor shown him couched in the most respectful and obsequious terms. The companion piece to the *Todesgedanken*, *Margaris*, a work which Birken had written in commemoration of the death of his wife, must also have been included in the same volume, since Kuhlmann extends his sympathy and praises the work extravagantly by addressing Birken's wife as follows: "O Glückseelig-entseelte Margaris! . . . Du hast der Welschen Lauren, di Lorbern entwunden, weil jene nur Petrarche, dich aber einer, der den Hoch-teutschen mehr ist, beseelet" (2-51a). He also manages to include best wishes for the *Blumenorden*. It would have been customary for Kuhlmann to return the favor in kind by sending Birken some of his own works, but he regrets that this is impossible. "Doch was itz unterlassen worden, kan zu seiner zeit geschehen" (2-51a). Hence we know that none of the works appearing during the Jena period was ready at this time.

A second letter from Kuhlmann to Birken, dated February 25, 1671

[3] The serial numbers of letters quoted refer to the author's own catalogue of the MSS in the archives. The first number indicates the bundle; the second number is the group within any given bundle, and the letter of the alphabet refers to the specific page or letter in any particular group.

[4] For the complete text see Beare, to whom we owe the rediscovery of the poem, FG, cited above. Newald (*Die deutsche Literatur vom Späthumanismus zur Empfindsamkeit*, München, 1951, p. 270) erroneously quotes this title as a collection of poems and calls it "Entsprossene deutsche Psalmen."

[5] In any case, it is evident that Kuhlmann's *Himmlische Libes-küsse* was not "the first book which brought him praise from outside the circle of his Breslau acquaintances," as Beare claims (RA, p. 843).

[6] Hence we may see that Dr. von Faber du Faur's remark is not quite accurate, when he writes: "Ausser mit Athanasius Kircher, . . . stand er [Kuhlmann] mit keinem namhaften Dichter oder Gelehrten in Verbindung." Faber, *op. cit.*, p. 150.

(2-51b), dates specifically the composition of Kuhlmann's *Lehrreicher Geschicht-Herold*, which at the time of this letter is in the process of being printed. Kuhlmann sends Birken the first four signatures and requests that Birken write an opinion of the work. In reality, he expects a complimentary letter which he may include in the work "unter anderen Hoch-ädlen Gönnern" (2-51b). Kuhlmann estimates that the work will easily exceed fifty signatures "und kan solches desto glükkseeliger das tagelicht schauen, wann es von solchen Männern einen günstigen blikk empfangen" (2-51b). Strangely enough, no such complimentary poems or letters were included in the first edition of the *Geschicht-Herold*, and one may speculate if Kuhlmann is not indulging in a bit of typically egotistic, wishful thinking, in his mention of other prominent men who have contributed their compliments to the work.

Another unidentified work is mentioned in this letter with the apology that it has been dedicated to Birken. This could only be the second edition of the *Unsterbliche Sterblikeit*, which is dedicated to Birken, Neumark and Wende. In addition to the obvious compliment paid by the dedication, the choice of three prominent members of the *Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft* would seem to be a hint by Kuhlmann for membership in the society. I cannot agree with Beare's flat rejection [7] of Kuhlmann's *Entsprossende Teutsche Palmen* as a bid for membership in the society. The very tone of the poem is such extravagant flattery that it calls for an answer. We see that Birken repaid the compliment by a gift of two of his works. Moreover the poem fits perfectly the specifications of the very type of work which innumerable young aspirants to the honor of membership are advised to write.[8] Beare objects on the grounds that Kuhlmann is young and relatively unknown, with only one printed book to his credit. But this would have made little impression on his colossal egotism, as the letter quoted below amply demonstrates. It is not at all out of keeping with his personality for him to consider such membership no more than his due. The dedication of this second edition of the *Unsterbliche Sterblikeit* to three prominent members of the society cannot be otherwise interpreted than as a bid for membership. No other significant works

[7] Beare, RA, p. 836.

[8] Birken himself was given this advice when he was seeking admission to the *Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft* (cf. letter from Joh. Wilh. von Stubenberg, December 22, 1654, 6-2o), and, in turn, advised others to address such a laudatory work to influential members of the society (cf. letters from Osthof, January 31, 1648, 49-13a, and Dedekind, undated, 1-34e, among others).

had appeared between the *Entsprossende Teutsche Palmen* and the *Unsterbliche Sterblikeit*, so that if we grant that the latter work is an attempt to gain admission to the society, then there is no reason to reject the former work as a similar attempt.

The second letter in the archives is signed, "Quir. Kuhlmann Philos. e. Juris utriusque Studios." which indicates that Kuhlmann had some interest in the philosophical faculty as well as the faculty of law during his university period.

The third letter (dated April 10, 1672, 2-51c), accompanies a package of Kuhlmann's works which he is sending to Birken. It includes the *Himmlische Libes-küsse* and the *Lehrreiche . . . Tugend-Sonnenblumen*. He apologizes again for the dedication of the *Unsterbliche Sterblikeit* and tells Birken that if anything has been overlooked in the dedicatory epistle, Birken should not hesitate to call his attention to it so that it may be changed in the new edition "di in kurtzen wider erfolgen wird" (2-51c). This edition never did appear however. He also requests that Birken write a poem in honor of his newly acquired laureate. Several other "vornehme Patrone und Gönner [haben] ihre glükkwünschende Ehrenzeilen eingesendet" (2-51c). This wording is similar to the request for a letter to be included in the *Geschicht-Herold*, so that we may wonder again if Kuhlmann really has received such tributes from other prominent men. In the light of Kuhlmann's tendency to insert in his works at every opportunity any sort of tribute which he might have received, we may be doubtful. Among Birken's unpublished drafts of various poems is to be found a collection, entitled *Birken Wälder*, of which poem number 333 is this particular tribute from Birken to Kuhlmann. Since it is apparently not printed elsewhere, the text may be given here:

Auf H. Quirin Kuhlmans Poeten-Cron.

Du thust ja recht, du edles Slesien!
Daß du bey dir nicht lässest untergehn,
Dz Schöne Thun, dz erstlich hat bekom̃en
dem Bober Schwan. Es komt noch stäts geroñen.
Die Pimpler-Flut von deinem Helikon,
und Clio zeugt in dir so manchen Tohn
ob einer sich legt in die Erde nieder:
die leÿr stirbt nicht; ein andrer stimt si wider.
Jezt gibt dir auch dein Kuhlman neue Zier,
Der frucht zugleich u. blüte stöst herfür.
reift vor der Zeit, erwartet nicht das Jahre,
So widmet daſ auch billig seine haare,

Die Musen Kron, der Edl-Ahasver,
Der selber hat, u. andern giebet, Ehr.
So geht es recht! So muß es ferner gehen.
Viel Kränze noch mach' Ihn der Himel sehen.

The "Bober Schwan" is, of course, Martin Opitz, and "Die Pimpler-Flut" refers to the "stream" of poets from the literary Helicon of Silesia.[9] The "Ahasver" mentioned is Ahasverus Fritsch, whom Kuhlmann had met in Rudolstadt. It is interesting to note that Birken believes that Fritsch and not the Count of Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt has thus honored Kuhlmann.[10] Support for this assumption is given by Hagen in another letter to Birken, dated January 18, 1673 (49-31q), who, in referring to Kuhlmann, writes: "Von dem Ahasverô und seinen creaturen die Er zu Rittern geschlagen wäre noch eine feine Lach-materie vorhanden." Probably the answer is that Fritsch instigated the conferring of the laureate, but arranged it, for the sake of added prestige for Kuhlmann, that his student, the count, should issue the patent.

Possibly the most important document in the archives for our understanding of Kuhlmann as a Jena student is a letter from Hagen to Birken, in which Hagen, in reply to Birken's request, describes his fellow student, Kuhlmann, in detail. Since this very informative and enlightening letter has been nowhere published, I shall quote the text in full. The letter is dated January 29, 1672 (49-31n):

Was Mons. Kuhlmann (von dem E. Magnif. Nachricht verlanget) anlangt, hette ich ehdessen was hiervon gemeldet, wo nicht die blödigkeit meine Feder zuruckgehalten. Ich fürchtete, als würden E. Magnif. mich verdenken, als der Mons. Kuhlm. Glück und Famen mißgönstig seÿ: worvon doch meine Natur so ferne, daß ich jedermann mir vorsetze: keinen geringer halte ich als mich, dessen Mängel ich am besten kenne. Mons. Kuhlmann ist wiedersinnes. Er achtet nichts als was unter Seinen Nahmen leuchtet, und aus seiner Stirn entsprossen. Hält niemand gelehrter, als was sein Wesen hat. Dahero besucht er weder publicè noch privatim Collegia. Er hat mich vielfältig besuchet; Ich Ihn ebenfalls, sed rarius. Wann er discurirt, zeigt Er grosser leute Fehler, und wie Er es verbessert. It.[em] was er geschrieben, schreibe, und schreiben wolle. Schickt Brieffe an die Vornehmsten leute, als nach Rom, an den P. Kircher, quem coelo tenus jam tollit, mox in prostundum [sic] trahit; mox Dijs Deabusque Sapientia præponit, rursus ceu stultissimum infra pueros abjicit. Ingleichen in Engelland, und anderweit. Neulich erwehnte Er, wie ein unversuchter Vorschlag Ihn ängte [sic]. Nemlich, Er seÿ gesonnen, Seine Brieffe, und teutsche Send-schreiben, an grosse Personen, in etlichen Centurien (so hoch sollen sie noch wachsen) der Welt durch den Druck zu communiciren.

[9] Cf. B. Hederich, *Gründliches Lexicon Mythologicum* (Lpz., 1724).
[10] Cf. Beare, RA, p. 851.

Er wundere, worum es Gelehrte leute nicht lange schon angefangen? da wir doch im latein so viel vorgänger hetten. Ob Sie ihrem Stylo, oder Verstand mißgetraut, wäre Ihm zweiflich. beydes wiesse Er zu zeigen. Weil Schottelij opus in 4t. unvollkommen, wolle Er in foliô eines ediren, und den Grund der teutschen Sprache, auf eine Lullianische Art, heben. Lipsium ubique crepat, cujus vestigia se primum legisse, mox superasse gloriatur. Seine Eitelkeiten sind aus beygeschlossener Epistel, so Er unter den Nahmen eines einfältigen Studiosi, sich selbst zugeschrieben, darinnen er seine dotes erzehlet, abzumerken. Diese Epistel hat grosse Gelächter Weigelio meo & familiæ omni ejus, die sich tumm und taub daran gelesen, und doch nichts verstanden, wie vielen anderen, verursachet. Summa: man könde Ihn zu einem Sinnbild des ganzen Weltbegriffs stellen, und Salomons Symbolum dazuschreiben: Vanitas Vanitatum. Er will nun das teutsche etwas ruhen lassen, und Jura so ämsig studiren, daß Er einer Jahres-Frist doctoriren könne. Sed satis nugarum! Eines nur: Es hat Ihn ein wunderlicher Comes Palatinus neulich bekrönet, und zwar nobili coronâ. Dergleichen nobilitatos Poetas giebt es viel hier, daher darf ich nicht sagen, wer ich bin. nam etsi loquor, vix tamen videbor. was möchte vor ein Unterschied seÿn?

The letter speaks for itself, and, if we may accept Hagen's words, which may not, however, be without a trace of jealousy in the competition for Birken's favor, then we have a rather complete picture of this strange personality in his student days. His every action mirrors his colossal egotism, and the device of praising himself in a letter attributed to someone else is typical. Even at this early stage we may see the germs of Kuhlmann's later unbalanced fanaticism.

There is only one more reference to Kuhlmann in the archives, and that is in a letter from Georg Wende, one of the others to whom Kuhlmann dedicated the second edition of his *Unsterbliche Sterblikeit.* The reference is a mysterious one: "Zum beschluß bejam̃ere auch, dz mein hochgeehrter H. nebst mir durch Q. Kuhlmann, so nunmehr ein Chiliast worden, betrogen worden! Es sol mir dieses klägliche beÿspiel zur warnung dienen, dz ich ein ander mal gegen einen jungen ungemachten Menschen mißvertraulicher, oder vielmehr retaarder mich bezeigen werde. Doch hoffe ich noch, dz Er, nunmehr durch den Außgang wiederleget, auf andre Gedanken kom̃en werde. Jesus erleuchte Ihn und erbarme sich seiner verführten Seele!"

This letter is from Breslau, January 5, 1675 (5-22h), but one can only speculate as to how Birken and Wende were deceived by Kuhlmann. There are no other letters in the collection which might give us a clue, but as the gaps continue to be filled in Kuhlmann's biography, we may some day have the answer.

University of California, Berkeley BLAKE LEE SPAHR

REVIEWS

Eugene H. Falk, *Renunciation as a Tragic Focus* (Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1954. xvi + 97 pp. $3.00). THE indefinite article in the title of this thin volume is, one hopes, indicative of the scope of its author's purpose. As I read the book, renunciation is not held to be the focus of all tragic situations but merely one focus. Thus Mr. Falk cannot be accused of assuming that because a number of plays have been called "tragedies," there must subsist somewhere in an eternal realm a tragic essence whose nature he is setting out to explore.

This impression is borne out by Mr. Norman DeWitt's introduction, in which it is explained that the author's point of view is that of "personal humanism." Personal humanism, as contrasted with what is labeled "academic humanism," abandons the rationalistic either-or of classical logic for a philosophy which goes "beyond logic, intellectual mechanics, and determinism" (p. xiv). Presumably what it reaches in this supra-rational world is the individual. Now there is no doubt that the individual is a logical surd, but there is a question whether the human individual is in any situation in this respect other than that of any individual. The problem comes down to that of trying to make intelligible that which by its very nature is unintelligible. The answer might well have been that the attempt is futile. But, unless I misread the introduction, it can be accomplished through art.

If this is what Mr. DeWitt is driving at, then his colleague's five studies of tragedies elucidate how human individuals become intelligible—to themselves? to their readers? to their creator?—by renouncing their individuality by sacrificing their lives for a higher value. By an analysis of five tragedies, *Oedipus Rex*, *Antigone*, *Polyeucte*, Maeterlinck's *Aglavaine et Selysette*, and Samain's *Polyphème*, each of the heroes or heroines is shown to have sacrificed his or her life, which apparently Mr. Falk identifies with the self. Mr. Falk also maintains that his series of sacrifices are arranged in order of decreasingly worthy ends. But at least one reader found himself wondering whether the ends were not as much appraised by the traditional appraisal of the plays in which they appear as by an objective consideration of them as vital situations. For it may be legitimately

asked whether the renunciation of Oedipus is any more due to a devotion to "spiritual" values than that of Polyphemus. Mr. Falk argues that Polyphemus' renunciation is illusory. The renunciation of Oedipus is "essentially an act of atonement," that of Antigone "an act of obedience," that of Polyeucte and Selysette "an outgrowth of defeat, but simultaneously an act of glory, dignity and self-esteem" (p. 90 f.). The illusoriness of Polyphemus' renunciation lies in its being a "giving up the hope for a love . . . that would have made him happy even though it could only have been prompted by Galatea's pity." If this is so, then clearly it is different from the motivation of the other self-sacrifices. But in what sense of the word is it more illusory?

Presumably one sacrifices oneself for something spiritual if it is not human. If one can accept the law of the gods as more binding than that of one's natural impulses, then one is more spiritual. If that is so and if Mr. Falk wishes to generalize, then there would seem to be no such thing as a purely human tragedy. But then what does one do with the so-called tragedies of Shakespeare? None of them is treated by Mr. Falk. Does any hero of Shakespeare's tragedies sacrifice himself for a spiritual value in this sense of the word? It would perhaps then be simpler to reinterpret Mr. Falk's thesis as the struggle of the individual to become universal and meeting inevitable defeat in the process.

The Johns Hopkins University **GEORGE BOAS**

James Whaler, *Counterpoint and Symbol: An Inquiry into the Rhythm of Milton's Epic Style* (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1956. 226 pp. Anglistica, 6). ALL Milton scholars must, I think, be glad that Professor Whaler undertook the study that has resulted in the publication of this monograph. And nearly all will be sorry that in it he did not stop far, far short of the conclusions which he has felt compelled to reach.

The basic suggestion in *Counterpoint and Symbol* is that Milton learned from the elaborate and accomplished polyphonic music of his time certain techniques and devices which he used to enrich the poetic effect of *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained.* The simplest of these devices Professor Whaler calls "cross-rhythmic construction"; it is in effect the utilization of enjambement combined with

internal pause to produce short-range rhythmic patterns which—like the varied voices of contrapuntal music—contrast with, though they do not destroy, the underlying meter.

Two types of cross-rhythmic construction are initially distinguished. In the first (T-construction), an "integral line"—that is, a five-beat line without internal pause—is flanked in the context by two parts of lines the accents in which add up to five:

> Soon had his crew
> Open'd into the hill a spacious wound
> And digg'd out ribs of gold. (PL I. 688-690)

In the second (E-construction), the integral line is replaced by a line which itself contains pause, so that there is a momentary emergence of sequences which combine into units containing more or fewer than five beats, though the total number of beats will remain a multiple of five:

> . . . and rather than be less
> Car'd not to be at all; with that care lost
> Went all his fear. . . . (PL II. 47-49)

The two constructions, in their varied forms, may appear alone or in series; or they may combine with one another to produce sustained cross-rhythmic effects. It is Professor Whaler's contention that because even in a long passage elaborately wrought into cross-rhythmic patterns, the total number of beats involved in those patterns remains a multiple of five, Milton's basic metrical five-beat norm is constantly echoed and thus safeguarded. Meanwhile, the effect is, we are told, as though above a clear melodic line should rise another voice or voices in contrasting rhythm, the whole consort coming back together with, if not before, the full final line of a verse paragraph.

These observations seem to me interesting and highly suggestive. Clearly, however, such counterpointed rhythms must be heard if they are to have effect, and so the pauses with which cross-rhythmic constructions begin and end must surely be very marked—more decisively marked than Professor Whaler himself appears to feel necessary. Again, the counterpointed rhythms will be more clearly heard if they are reinforced by grammatical parallels and by alliteration, assonance etc.—and correspondingly made indistinct if musical and grammatical patterns move across or against them. Still, the effect of the counterpointed rhythms can be extraordinarily exciting, as anyone who notes their working in, say, PL X. 769-791—quoted by Professor Whaler—will agree.

But the presence of these patterns only begins to account for the extremely high proportion of enjambement and internal pause in Milton's epic verse, Professor Whaler tells us. Next he isolates an E-construction based on a Pythagorean sequence of one-, two-, three- and four-beat groups:

> Who seeks
> To lessen thee, against his purpose serves
> To manifest the more thy might: (PL VII. 613-615)

—and straightway we are upon the stony path of mystical numerology. For one, two, three and four add up to ten, the Pythagorean symbol of perfection. Whenever the ascending series occurs in Milton, we are told, " the context is one that stresses or implies an affirmative idea of perfection, absolute completeness, order, truth, harmony, or some virtue " (p. 53). Whenever the descending series 4-3-2-1 occurs, " the context is one that stresses or implies an idea of negation, imperfection, disorder, ruin, impotence, ignorance, hate, malice, abasement, or deadly sin " (p. 56).

Professor Whaler gives many examples, and can perform such feats of interpretation (including an explanation of why Adam and Eve's repentance at the end of PL X. must be considered affirmative, and brocaded with six ascending series, while at the beginning of PL XI. it must be felt as negative, as a miserable abasement, and figured with an elaborated descending series) that we begin to chill with doubt. Meanwhile, protesting constantly now and from this point on that he himself does not *want* to believe these things, but that incontrovertible logic forces him to do so, Professor Whaler is dragged down into a nether world where straightforward communication, and the magnificent formal effects of Milton's poetry as we know them, dissipate into dark cloud, and the hallucinatory suns of symbolic number rise to wither our sight.

The Pythagorean sequence, it develops, may be expanded by simple multiplication: 2-4-6-8, 20-15-10-5, etc. The multiplier may have a literal appropriateness (the *duality* of God the Son, the *triple* curse of Genesis), or it may be symbolic: 4 is the number of creation, 7 the number of God, and so on. The sequence may also be expanded in geometric power series—r^2, $2r^2$, $3r^2$, $4r^2$; r^1, r^2, r^3, r^4; r^1, r^2, r^4, r^8 provide examples, in which again " r " will have symbolic value. Any punctuated pause may divide one term of an expanded Pythagorean sequence from the next, and Professor Whaler maintains that some of the eccentric punctuation of the first edition of PL can be explained

only as serving to delimit the terms of symbolic sequences and progressions.

The ultimate intent of all this is to analyze "the Miltonic paragraph as a rhythmic analogue to a piece of contrapuntal music" (p. 71), in which every progression performs as a "cross-rhythmic voice." Each such voice (and there may be several performing at once) may, like the individual voice in polyphonic music, "enter at any point of pause and depart at any point" (p. 73). And because the number of beats required to fulfil a geometric power series may rapidly shoot beyond the number of beats in a given paragraph—the perfect construction of which these series are meant to illuminate—Professor Whaler invokes the example of "perpetual canon" and directs us, when we have got to the end of a paragraph without exhausting the progression, to begin again at the beginning, and go through as many times as need be. Perpetual canon—in verse that moves inexorably forward from sentence to sentence, from paragraph to paragraph? But all this is explained, in Milton, as a participation in the mathematical spirit of the baroque.

The examples Professor Whaler gives us take up dozens of pages, and are mostly expressed in highly complex mathematical symbol and diagram. Let us illustrate only once, and with a relatively simple situation, found in PL V. 28-94. At the phrase "for I this night" (V. 30) begins a retrograde series based on eleven: 44, 33, 22, 11. (An unaccented syllable may be missing from the beginning of a given group—here the second—or found redundant at the end—as in the first and fourth groups here—without impairing the progression.) The series ends at the colon after the words "interdicted knowledge" in line 52. At once begins a direct series based on nineteen: 19, 38, 57, 76; it ends with the punctuated pause after the words "high exaltation" in line 90. At this point a primary retrograde series (4, 3, 2, 1) begins, but is missing its final term, a one-beat term set off by punctuation which is expected, but not present. The third term in the series ends thirteen beats from the end of the paragraph, as the retrograde eleven series began thirteen beats from its beginning. . . . The explanation? Eleven stands for obeisance or order—Professor Whaler decides this for himself, basing his decision on Joseph's second dream in the Old Testament—and in retrograde series, therefore, for *dis*order. Eve's dream is a dream of disobedience, and is the first threat to Eden's perfection. The series ends when Eve is brought abruptly to "the tree / Of interdicted

knowledge." The tree seems to her, in the dream, wondrous, miraculous: and since 9 is the Dantean symbol for wonder, miracle, and any base number may where appropriate be "aggrandized" or intensified by the perfection-symbol 10, the direct 19-series that now begins expresses the "truly wondrous" quality of Eve's vision, and ends on its own "high exaltation," mathematically, emotionally and verbally. From that exaltation Eve *sinks*, her guide gone (4-3-2-)—but she does not literally *fall*, since this is a dream, from which, thankfully, she now wakes. So the last term of the primary retrograde progression is missing. Professor Whaler does not explain the 13-beat frame of the paragraph, but could have done so on the ground that "unlucky thirteen," standing for the supernumerary thirteenth rib on Adam's left side from which Eve was created, is earlier (p. 44) cited as, in foreboding circumstances, Eve's number.

If Professor Whaler's "discoveries" can be found attractively displayed, it is here. But even here, his willingness to assign a (highly flexible) meaning to a given number where he finds none traditionally used, and his glibness in explaining away a flawed sequence, may make us doubt. Elsewhere we find that many numbers have a generous range of meaning, or may have more meanings than one: 5, for example, may as the sum of 2 (woman) and 3 (man) mean marriage, but it may also mean power; 10 may mean perfection, but as a multiple of 5 it too may mean power; 13 may mean something horrid about Eve, but it may (conveniently) signify rather justice, righteousness—not, apparently, "perfect man" (3 plus 10), though why not? Apparently Professor Whaler found no context that could be made "responsive" in those terms. One comes early to be staggered at the flexibility, even the ambiguity or illogic, of what is triumphantly asserted as "responsive"—in PL IX. 896-916, for example, where Adam throws in his lot with Eve *instead of retaining his fealty to God*, the paragraph is "scribed and circumscribed" with an infinite progression based on the root-number 7, God's number (pp. 116-117). Well, the whole poem is in a sense about God, for that matter. And when the imperfections of flawed, dislocated and interrupted progressions can be explained away invariably in terms of dramatic appropriateness, this too must make us wonder.

But there is no difficulty that Professor Whaler cannot seem to explain away, because there is no evasive action that he cannot take. The reader is not always, to be sure, convinced. Professor Whaler can, exceptionally, find root-numbers *without* symbolic significance,

and see a propriety in the resulting "ambiguous mathematical situation" (p. 146). He can find the Pythagorean series, upon which the whole symbolic system is based, extended, again exceptionally, beyond four terms (p. 152). His purpose is to explain Milton's paragraph as an unalterable unit, but he can propose the shifting of paragraph boundaries without the authority of an early edition (pp. 145-150), and he can, exceptionally once more, suggest as symbolically intended a short sequence that binds two paragraphs together, even though the first paragraph is additionally involved in a construction that turns back spirally upon itself (p. 141). Most strikingly, after arguing over and over that the patterns he finds and interprets could not have been produced by chance, he admits that meaningless series, "hundreds of them, are bound to be fortuitously present" (p. 130), and decides that Milton, had he known about their presence, "would have welcomed them" (p. 135) even though they had no symbolic appropriateness. How much of the argument must now rest on our page-by-page acceptance of Professor Whaler's lithe symbolic explications, need hardly be pointed out.

But the system must in any event, one might think, be too cumbersome ever to have been managed consciously—especially where rapidly expanding power progressions are involved. Professor Whaler is not thus to be trapped, however; there are many back doors to this burrow. On p. 45 it is suggested to us that Milton probably employed a mechanical aid, which he could operate by touch, to keep track of pause through elaborate progressions. Well then, what about Milton's description of his verse as "easy," "unpremeditated"? The answer is that we are not to believe it except as the description of the writing of the first draft of a paragraph (pp. 83, 166). But in the more complicated patterns, surely the demarcating pauses are often very light in comparison with intervening pauses, and fall at points which are in terms of symbolic meaning arbitrary, unresponsive? So it is in contrapuntal music. But in contrapuntal music the voices are at least *heard*, are they not? Milton, we are told, wished to keep his structural invention secret from us—though Professor Whaler does not hesitate to call the "rhythms" set in motion by that invention "expressive" (p. 159). Heard melodies are sweet, but. . . .

It is time to reach a conclusion. We cannot doubt the presence in Milton of simple "cross-rhythmic construction"; and I should be inclined to agree that there are brief and audible rhythmic maneuvers in which a stated number is echoed and supported metrically. Beyond

this, we must remain skeptical—especially when we recall how many other of the appreciable devices of poetry Milton uses, with brilliant and complicated mastery, now to vary, now to reinforce, the structure of his verse paragraph. Prosody is not so helpless to discover that structure as Professor Whaler suggests (pp. 160, 163)—though the sphere of prosody is always limited.

But in the end it must be asserted, I think, that poetry is meant to be heard, and that a formal device which cannot be heard *even when one has "discovered" it*—is nothing. It can do nothing, it can move nothing, it can bestow upon poetry no immortality, no perfection baroque or other. If then—as I must doubt—Milton had the "secret aims" with which Professor Whaler credits him, I can only be sorry that they have not remained secret. There could be no profit in them, no pleasure, save to the discoverer. And even as I write this, I seem to hear Professor Whaler whispering,

> . . . if such pleasure be
> In things to us forbidden, it might be wish'd,
> For this one tree had been forbidden ten. . . .

Pomona College EDWARD R. WEISMILLER

J. Milton French, ed., *The Life Records of John Milton: Vol. IV, 1655-1669* (New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1956. 482 pp. $7.50). IN publishing this fourth volume of the *Life Records*, Professor French approaches the end of his epoch-making compilation of every fact known about Milton's life. The years covered are 1655 through 1669—a period of extraordinary political activity in England, matched in Milton's own life by his continuing activity as Latin Secretary, by his second and third marriages, and by the publication of *Paradise Lost*. The central fact in the volume is the restoration of Charles II to the throne, sharply cleaving Milton's active career in the government from years in which he suffered from imprisonment, from loss by the fire of 1666, and especially from attacks made by his long-hushed antagonists. One may judge that he was notorious after 1660 for his views on divorce, for *Eikonoklastes*, for his *Defenses*, and for his theories about the commonwealth. To support himself through these difficult years Milton indeed had to have the faith in himself which he had expressed in his sonnet to Cyriak Skinner. His life

from 1652 onward is, in fact, a remarkable testimony to the vitality of his early ethical and religious training.

Yet the latter part of the volume is disappointing because of the tantalizingly small amount of biographical material which has survived. Thus 1667, the year of the publication of *Paradise Lost*, is covered in just fifteen pages. Indeed, the years 1661 through 1669 average only about ten and a half pages per year, compared with the fifty-nine page per year average of 1655 through 1660 (so far, the years from 1651 through 1654 covered in volume III present the most extensive records, averaging almost one hundred and twenty pages per year). The earlier part of this fourth volume is, however, made up for the most part of the Letters of State and voluminous law suits. The years after the Restoration are those when we would most like to have more personal information. When, for instance, was *Paradise Regained* begun and finished? Ellwood implies that he suggested the subject to Milton in August (?) 1665 and then apparently saw the complete work sometime in 1666—before March 13 or after June 25. Although these dates are surely too close together, Ellwood's evidence is all that we have.

Professor French has probably less hitherto unpublished material in this volume than in any of its predecessors. What little new information there is comes mostly from a series of newly discovered letters which Henry Oldenburg wrote to Milton. They do not change the traditional image of the poet. Instead, the vast bulk of quotation in this book is taken from the familiar Letters, the Letters of State, the early biographies, and the author's *Milton in Chancery*. The value in his treatment of this familiar material comes first from the author's unification of it into a chronological unity and second from his careful explanation and evaluation of each item. As he did in each of the preceding volumes, Professor French has added immeasurably to the value of his compilation by his able judgment of the significance of each detail. His work is careful and accurate. I have noted singularly few errors: Sir Thomas Phillipps' name is misspelled on page 303; a quotation in the annotation on page 379 should perhaps have a separate entry; Richard Powell is called *brother* rather than *brother-in-law* on page 400. All in all, this series of books is one of which American scholarship may be proud.

Baylor University WM. B. HUNTER, JR.

Kester Svendsen, *Milton and Science* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1956. x + 304 pp. $5.50). ONE of the many products of George Coffin Taylor's study of Milton and Du Bartas, published over twenty years ago, was its stress upon the importance of the hexaemeral and mirrour literatures for an understanding of *Paradise Lost*. Although his emphasis upon the *Divine Weekes* as a *vade mecum* for most scholarly problems today seems overly optimistic, Taylor's basic argument for the importance of the hexaemeral and mirrour traditions has directed the work of many scholars. Of the former Kirkconnell's large compilation is representative; Kester Svendsen's studies best exemplify the latter. In his present book Dr. Svendsen has combined his many periodical articles into a unified study, has added a considerable body of new material, and now presents an authoritative analysis of the traditional science to be found in Milton's works, both prose and poetry. The book not merely clarifies many difficult passages but also is a central contribution to the history of science and the literary use of the scientific commonplace.

Dr. Svendsen's method is to compile from six popular renaissance compendia the traditional scientific materials which Milton wove into his poetry and prose. Such materials, of course, do not look forward to the achievements of the Royal Society and of subsequent science. Their origins rather lie in similar classical collections like those of Pliny and Isidore of Seville, and in popular superstitions. For hundreds of years these ideas had been believed and repeated by an uncritical population; Milton is typical of his day in his naive acceptance of them. As Dr. Svendsen concludes, "The number of allusions is large; the range of information and the depth is narrow and small. Whatever he may have known out of books or experience, he used only conventional, comparatively shallow medieval and Renaissance commonplaces in physiology, psychology, and medicine."

After a brief introductory survey of his topic, Dr. Svendsen shows the enormous help of the popular encyclopedias in clarifying ten passages—two each from the fields of mineralogy, botany, zoology, biology, and cosmology. Having established and illustrated his method, the author then considers in detail each passage in the Milton corpus which is based upon the encyclopedic traditions. Finally, the last two chapters show how some of Milton's prose imagery, especially that of the *Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, and some of the poetic imagery of *Paradise Lost* is governed by this scientific thought. Such an organization inevitably leads to some duplications, but it also gains in

clarity. The annotations of this extensive body of material are full, well balanced, and entirely adequate.

The method of this study is, then, both sound and convincing. If anyone today is so daring as to emphasize source hunting in Milton, his enthusiasm will be quickly cooled—at least for scientific materials—by the literally thousands of analogues which the author educes to show that many of Milton's scientific ideas are seventeenth century commonplaces rather than the property of an educated minority. From this point of view the study is one of the most important to appear in Milton scholarship in many years—both for its positive help in exegesis and for its proof that we must beware of confusing a "source" with what actually is commonplace information. On the other hand, these encyclopedias cannot explain everything; Dr. Svendsen's thorough and accurate scholarship brings in other sources whenever these books fail. Thus on page 29 the analysis of *Paradise Lost* III, 595 ff., offers a sound analysis of lapidary art from the encyclopedias in explaining the appearance of the parts of the sun as carbuncle, chrysolite, ruby, and so on. But these books utterly fail to clarify the recondite alchemy which also lies back of the passage, and which the author draws upon in discussing the passage. The very thorough notes thus cover many materials not to be found in the popular mirrour literature, with the result that the study may unconsciously imply more significance to these popular treatments than the author really meant.

In only a few details is the book disappointing. First, as to minutiae, there are a few obvious misprints but only three of any moment: the reading of *adjust* for *adust* on page 122, the omission of footnote 15 to Chapter VII, and the omission of footnote 6 from the text of the last chapter. Occasionally the encyclopedias do not come up to expectation (through no fault of Dr. Svendsen). Thus Milton mentions the emmet, which "in small room large heart enclos'd." This odd "fact" about the relative size of an ant's heart seems just the sort of material for an encyclopedist, but it remains unexplained. Far more serious is the author's utter omission of Milton's conception of the passions—psychological states closely allied to such entities as the humours and the spirits, which the book does treat. The encyclopedias are full of details concerning the passions, explaining and characterizing each, and classifying them in quite varied ways. The same traditional theory of the passions is also basic to *Paradise Lost*. Milton often discusses the subject—it is important in the *Christian Doctrine*,

for instance—and in view of the thorough treatment of it which the encyclopedias offer its omission from the present study is somewhat hard to justify.

Such observations, however, should not detract from the positive achievements of this book. It gives a welcome new approach to the relationship of Milton and contemporary thought. Many passages offer brilliant critical insights; the interpretations of the close of *Paradise Lost* and the discussion of the darkened Satan on the bright sun are examples of the critical acuity and sound insight which Dr. Svendsen brings to the reading of literature. His methods and conclusions should be accepted by Miltonists everywhere.

Baylor University WM. B. HUNTER, JR.

Alan Dugald McKillop, *The Early Masters of English Fiction* (Lawrence: Univ. of Kansas Press, 1956. ix + 233 pp. $5.00). Ian Watt, *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson and Fielding* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press; London: Chatto and Windus, 1957. 319 pp. $4.50). IT is remarkable that two such well-informed yet strikingly different books on eighteenth-century prose fiction should have appeared at almost the same time; although their findings are often complementary, these studies present a sharp contrast in approach and method.

Professor McKillop offers "a brief critical and historical survey" of the major works of Defoe, Richardson, Fielding, Smollett, and Sterne. This takes the form of five separate, though interrelated, essays which endeavour to view the novelists "in the light of their age, and also in the light of the heightened consciousness of the theory of prose fiction which is characteristic of our own time." As befits the informality of the essay, the organization is loose. The general plan is to take up each author's productions in chronological order and to introduce discussions of social background, literary influences, artistic conventions, and the like wherever such material seems pertinent. Biographical detail (most prominent in the Smollett chapter) is used sparingly and shrewdly to elucidate the fiction under consideration. The result is a suggestive survey by a guide who has exceptional knowledge of the terrain and who furnishes much more than a resumé of historical fact and current opinion.

Although Professor Watt accords extended treatment to fewer novels

and novelists, his study is longer, more formal, and more ambitious. He proposes to discover why the English novel was born during "a single generation" without resorting to theories of genius or accident, "the twin faces on the Janus of the dead ends of literary history." To aim at such a goal suggests scholarly intrepidity as well as a refreshing faith in causation. The method chosen is logical and difficult. It involves three major tasks: (1) to define the essential traits of the genre with sufficient precision to keep the object of the investigation clear; (2) to isolate factors in the intellectual, social, and economic life of the period that shaped the fiction of Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding; (3) to determine in what senses *Robinson Crusoe, Moll Flanders, Pamela, Clarissa,* and *Tom Jones* contributed, or failed to contribute, to the evolution of the novel as a peculiar form of literary art. These matters are not treated in consecutive steps leading mechanically to a conclusion; instead, like an adroit novelist manipulating a multiple plot, Watt interweaves his themes so that they appear to develop almost simultaneously but without confusion. The stimulating results, which this review will not attempt to summarize, justify the author's approach and method. If he has hardly succeeded in providing answers that will satisfy everybody—and there will be disagreement in plenty about some of his conclusions—he has gathered an impressive array of fact and theory from widely scattered fields, and by bringing this material to bear on "the rise of the novel" he has produced a book which should become a landmark in twentieth-century criticism of prose fiction.

Inevitably these two studies overlap at many points, but their radical differences in approach are revealed by the sources they cite. Aside from common references to a handful of standard items, there is practically no duplication. A noteworthy feature of McKillop's survey is his practice of illustrating eighteenth-century opinion by giving unhacknied quotations from manuscripts and obscure publications. On the other hand, Watt ranges over wide tracts of learning, citing works on philosophy, sociology, anthropology, political economy and so on with a versatility that will astonish the conventional student of literature. Who would have supposed, for example, that something called *African Systems of Kinship and Marriage* would help one interpret *Pamela?*

Even when McKillop and Watt draw on articles in modern literary journals, they are seldom interested in the same ones. Indeed literary influences in the traditional sense seem comparatively unimportant to

Watt (though he is deeply concerned with literary history). He can see "little sign of mutual influence" in the works of Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding, and he is inclined to shrug off the last novelist's theory of the comic epic in prose as a notion that was hastily conceived to bolster the dignity of a new form of writing. McKillop, on the contrary, sees *Grandison* as in part a reaction to *Tom Jones*, *Amelia* as written for "a public that interested itself in Richardson's heroines," and the Preface to *Joseph Andrews*, which he analyzes with great astuteness, as "the most important critical document in the history of English prose fiction up to this time." Such apparently conflicting attitudes spring largely from the differences in approach. It would be a mistake, I believe, to interpret them as indications of fundamental disagreement. Suffice it to say that in Watt the references to Locke outnumber those to Cervantes, and in McKillop the reverse is true; to Watt Descartes' thought has prophetic significance for the novel, whereas McKillop fails to mention the father of modern philosophy. Multiplying such instances would but labor the obvious point that these investigations strive to illuminate their subject from different angles.

As for the light thrown on the individual novelists, I find McKillop's treatment of Richardson and Sterne and Watt's treatment of Defoe and Richardson especially revealing. Apparently our critics share the feeling that Richardson's achievement has been underrated, partly because of Fielding's greater popularity; if this feeling was warranted, they have redressed the balance handsomely. Both McKillop and Watt have perceptive discussions of Fielding, who is rather a special case because he makes so much trouble for the critic who looks at the art of the novel through Jamesian spectacles. No responsible critic can deny that Fielding was a great writer, but he must needs be an imperfect novelist, for he pays no attention to the rules—I refer, of course, to rules which were none of his making.[1] McKillop occasionally suggests that Fielding's methods detract from the realism of his art, but the point is not elaborated. It is quite central, however, in Watt, whose conception of the genre demands that he demonstrate how Fielding 'breaks the illusion.' Yet Watt has high praise for the novelist who "brought to the genre something that is ultimately even

[1] Perhaps the most outrageous thing that Fielding ever did is rarely mentioned, no doubt because it appears only in the original edition of *Amelia*: he inserted a "commercial" in the best TV style at the end of his most serious work of fiction.

more important than narrative technique—a responsible wisdom about human affairs which plays upon the deeds and characters of his novels." McKillop's parting tribute to Fielding is as sweeping as Gibbon's famous compliment: ". . . a broad and humane humor unmatched in its toleration of man's limitations and possibilities save in Shakespeare and Cervantes."

A comparison of these valuable books should make it difficult to forget a truth often ignored in modern criticism: the most diverse techniques may be applied to the same literary materials with fruitful results when the investigators are men of learning.

University of Iowa CHARLES B. WOODS

Charles Churchill, *Poetical Works*, ed. Douglas Grant (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1956. xxii + 587 pp. $10.10). UNTIL recently the literary career of Charles Churchill was badly neglected by scholars. This neglect is hard to understand, for Churchill was one of the most colorful and significant figures of the later eighteenth century, and his work is an important link in the satiric tradition which led from Dryden and Pope to Byron. In the last few years, however, he has received increasing attention. W. C. Brown's *Charles Churchill, Poet, Rake, and Rebel,* 1953, brought together most of the available biographic data in an entertaining and authentic picture of the poet against the background of his time. Another major contribution to Churchill scholarship is Douglas Grant's recently published edition of his *Poetical Works.*

In his edition Professor Grant has accomplished successfully three of the editor's major tasks: he has produced a reliable text, he has written an admirable introduction, and he has done a careful and thorough job of annotation. For the text of Churchill's major works Grant has followed the first edition of each poem, unless the poem was expanded in later editions, in which case he has followed the text of the last edition to be enlarged. In addition to the works known to be Churchill's he has included a few short poems which can plausibly be attributed to him. None of these is of much intrinsic value; the longest and perhaps the best of them is the *Epistle to R. L. L.* Grant has also listed and discussed briefly six other poems which have been attributed to Churchill but which he does not accept as genuine.

Grant's introduction is devoted almost exclusively to a brief summary of Churchill's life. Despite its comparative brevity it manages to weed out the obviously unreliable stories which have grown up about him and to present compactly but thoroughly the essential biographical data.

Perhaps Professor Grant's most important contribution to our knowledge of Churchill is to be found in his annotation of the poems. Packed as they are with contemporary allusions, many of which are obscure, Churchill's poems need such annotation if they are to be made intelligible to modern readers. Although Grant has made some use of the work of two earlier editors, Tooke and Laver, he has consistently gone back to original sources, particularly newspapers and magazines, to correct and augment their work. Many of his notes present completely new material. His annotations of individual poems, which appear at the back of the book, are regularly divided into two parts: a general headnote explaining the circumstances which led to the writing of the poem and any considerations concerning it as a whole, and notes on individual passages.

This ably edited work should be both a stimulus and an aid to further study of Churchill.

University of Missouri EDWARD H. WEATHERLY

J. T. Fain, *Ruskin and the Economists* (Nashville: Vanderbilt Univ. Press, 1956. 164 pp. $4.00). WHEN we recall the stir that Ruskin caused with his writings on political economy during his life time, it is startling to become aware that in the years since Ruskin's death only one scholar has given serious and sustained attention to Ruskin as an economist. That man is Professor John T. Fain, and this book is the fruit of his studies.

Professor Fain has drawn upon his own substantial knowledge of the history and the technical vocabulary of economic theory to isolate and set forth Ruskin's political economy. In doing this he has taken advantage of his better perspective in order to modify and to correct Hobson's pioneer work.

Fain argues in this book that Ruskin's attacks upon such orthodox economists as J. S. Mill were grossly unfair, although he makes it clear that Ruskin had a legitimate target in the popularizations and in some of the applications of those doctrines. On the other hand,

Fain insists that Ruskin did make a modest contribution to the science of political economy and that he has a place in the line of social economists that runs from Sismondi through Veblen. One-third of the book is a study of the economics of *Unto This Last.*

By placing Ruskin in the history of political economy instead of treating him as an eccentric, Fain has written a useful book, but it must have been a difficult book to write. Ruskin eternally warred against the isolation of political economy from social, humanistic, and aesthetic considerations, yet Professor Fain's project has required that he force upon Ruskin just that violent separation which he abhorred. Consequently this is a lean book and it is not easy to read. We must hop back and forth picking and scratching at Ruskin's works to locate bits of pure political economy. But the book needed to be written and it does confirm the judgment of scholars who have felt that the more fruitful avenues of approach to Ruskin are through his biography, his art criticism, and his social doctrines—not through his economics.

Saint Louis University CHARLES T. DOUGHERTY

Adaline Glasheen, *A Census of Finnegans Wake: An Index of the Characters and Their Roles* (Evanston: Northwestern Univ. Press, 1956. xxx + 146 pp. Northwestern Univ. Studies, Humanities Series, 32. $5.00). Marvin Magalaner, ed., *A James Joyce Miscellany* (New York: The James Joyce Society, 1957. 77 pp. $2.50).

BECAUSE of Joyce's elaborate weaving of material themes, verbal motifs and psychological associations, a concordance to any of his major works is likely to have more uses than most concordances; for, as Miles Hanley pointed out in *A Word-Index to James Joyce's Ulysses,* it can help us not only to locate passages but also to see things in the plot that we might not have seen otherwise. Edmund Wilson complained that *Ulysses* was overplotted; Thornton Wilder, in "Joyce and the Modern Novel," the opening essay in Mr. Magalaner's collection, deftly points out some of the strands that appear and reappear throughout *Finnegans Wake,* in such a way as to suggest that readers will go on discovering others almost infinitely.

Mrs. Glasheen's *Census* clarifies many details of Joyce's rich texture; it is an invaluable guide to the themes involving names of persons. In Joyce's dream language the names are often disguised, and the disguises are often very thick; Mrs. Glasheen has an uncommon

ability to penetrate them. She can see Osiris in "Oldsire" and "dosiriously," the Virgin Mary in "mirrage" and "bemolly," Johnny MacDougal in "Podex," Margaret Sanger in "Population Peg," and Matthew, Mark, Luke and John in "mummurlubejubes." Her readings are always justified by the context; she never mistakes one John for another.

In addition to giving page and line numbers for each appearance of each variant of each name, Mrs. Glasheen has (1) compiled a table showing "Who is Who when Everybody is Somebody Else," which helps us to keep the relationships of the characters straight through all their changes of name; (2) outlined the plot in the most cogent synopsis I have seen, and (3) written a preface that accounts for and justifies *Finnegans Wake*'s willful obscurity.

The *Census* is marred but not damaged by a number of typographical errors; some few of these will be corrected in a British edition now being prepared by Faber, Faber, Eliot and Faber. More important, the British edition will contain a great many new identifications, some made by Mrs. Glasheen, others sent to her by the Joyceans of the world, who seem to be united in this if in nothing else.

Their diversity of views is well illustrated in Mr. Magalaner's well-named *Miscellany*. Within the limited number of pages at his disposal Mr. Magalaner has contrived to represent all the major types of writing about Joyce: the learned appreciation (Thornton Wilder), the detailed exegesis (Julian Kaye), the journalist's record (Alfred Kerr), the biographical exposition (Leon Edel and Georges Markow Totévy), the personal reminiscence (Maria Jolas), and the relevant tangential comment (J. B. Yeats and Margaret Anderson). It is a deft, skillful job of editing.

Perhaps the most significant single item it contains is M. Totévy's "James Joyce and Louis Gillet," an account of the orthodox man of letters' slow conversion from uncomprehending hostility to wholehearted admiration. It is an archetypical illustration of the change in Joyce's position from that of a queer contributor to little magazines to that of a great writer whose works are studied in the universities.

Mrs. Jolas quarrels with Harriet Weaver, with Mr. Magalaner, with Richard M. Kain, and with others unnamed, by way of maintaining what seems to be an almost proprietary interest in Joyce. This is representative of another fact about Joyce—the difficulty of finding the truth among all the hot words.

The *Miscellany,* published on the seventy-fifth anniversary of Joyce's birth and the tenth anniversary of the James Joyce Society, is thus an item of considerable value for literary history. It has a pleasant foreword by Padraic Colum.

Pennsylvania State University J. MITCHELL MORSE

Imbrie Buffum, *Studies in the Baroque from Montaigne to Rotrou* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1957. xv + 256 pp. Yale Romanic Studies, 2nd series, 4. $5.00). IF we look at these six essays on Montaigne, Saint François de Sales, Jean de La Ceppède, Saint-Amant, the young Corneille, and Rotrou as classroom interpretations collected in a book, we certainly admire the didactic skill and the variety of presentation. Thus the concrete form of the *Essays* is made evident by the retranslation of some formulations into abstract thought. The *Introduction à la vie dévote* is an extensive study of similes. The *Théorèmes* are presented as a plea for allegedly great poetry. Saint-Amant, despite his trifles in general, is with his *Contemplateur* raised to the level of Milton's *Penseroso.* The three early plays of Corneille, *L'Illusion comique, Clitandre,* and *Mélite,* are made interesting as a study of variants from the earlier to the later editions. *Saint Genest* is retold in the form of a splendid running commentary. I would agree to call all these works "baroque" in the sense of a modern vague characterization coming from an *homme de lettres.*

But Mr. Buffum leaves no doubt that he tries to further literary scholarship by investigating (p. 240) this ticklish question of the baroque with the help of his material. Here I am sorry not to be able to agree with him. First of all, according to the reasonable advice of René Wellek, it is meaningless to approach a group of works with a pre-established "postulated" (p. 240) fulcrum without having analyzed previously each work according to its own merits and with unbiased, pure, stylistic principles, not with a mixture of categories concerning not only literary stylistics (exaggeration, contrast, surprise) but also cultural or "Zeitgeist" tendencies (moral purpose, theatricality, acceptance of life), motifs (horror, illusion, metamorphosis), philosophy or theology of history (incarnation) and structural qualities (organic unity). The slogan "form and spirit" (p. xii) for this mixture is no excuse, the spirit appearing in the form to be explained.

In the second place this book follows the same debatable method as

its never mentioned, though superior and much more circumspect predecessor, Wylie Sypher's *Four Stages of Renaissance Style* (1955), namely the method of comparing the literature of one single country with the art of all Europe. Doing this, the author is bound to run into a third bias, namely to mix up the categories (p. viii) of the historian of French literature (Renaissance, preclassicism, classicism) with the categories of the "comparatiste," be it in literature or in art (Renaissance [i. e. classicism], anticlassic mannerism, baroque). Even if we suppose for a moment that this telescoping of the two types of periodization were acceptable and that there were no overlapping in the evolution of styles, Mr. Buffum is left with a chronological difficulty. According to him, the baroque period extends from 1570-1650. Then I cannot help asking whether Renaissance plus mannerism (I wonder why Scève as well as Sponde are considered mannerists, p. 246) fills just these poor twenty years from 1550-1570, since before 1549 (Du Bellay's *Défense*) there is no Renaissance consciousness in France but only a slightly Italianized flamboyant style in art and literature, although Southern Europe, Italy, and even Spain are much more advanced at this time in their earlier, more accelerated development from the Renaissance to the baroque.

The fourth and greatest weakness of these artificially linked essays is the ignoring of previous critical, scholarly work on literary mannerism and baroque. Mr. Buffum feels very well the main difference between an irreconcilable dichotomy in mannerism and a resolved tension in the baroque (p. 227). If this holds true, Montaigne and Rotrou cannot be put on the same level. Actually, Montaigne (and not only in the early essays) is a typical mannerist (p. 57), since his interior undecidedness hesitates also stylistically between the condensation of the Senecan amble (Croll) to which he subdues the predominantly short verbal patterns of his metaphoric imagery (*Convivium* III [1954], 284-90), and the restless amplifications and bulging additions to the single essays. There is, of course, a perspectivism, "a proliferation of different points of view" (p. 36) in the ideological wavering and the different ways of approach through different similes, but this perspectivistic undecidedness ("que sais-je"?) is inside the text and can by no means be compared to the activity of a sightseer outside the work of art who looks at a baroque church from different angles. Finally it is more than strained to apply Wöfflin's criterion of a structural painterly unity of inseparable and irreplaceable elements to the "ondoyant and divers" (p. 76)

units of *lopins* badly strung together. Mr. Buffum seems to feel that his category of organic unity rather would apply to Racine and Molière (p. 55), nevertheless he goes on. If there is a unity in the *Essays,* it is a symphonic unity based on changing recurrent motifs, as was well recognized by René Jasinski in his contribution to the *Mélanges Chamard* (1951), 257-67, which seems unknown to Mr. Buffum, although Jasinski deals with the essay *De la vanité* analyzed by Mr. Buffum.

Similar considerations apply to St. François de Sales, whom Mr. Buffum surprisingly calls "far from austere" (p. 81). Had Mr. Buffum known the dissertation of Br. Cecilian Strebing, *Devout Humanism as a Style: St. Francis de Sales' Introduction à la vie dévote* (Washington, 1954), he would have seen how a style appears manneristic when in constant retractations it takes back what apparently was first conceded; for instance: you go to a ball, but—only if impelled by "condescendance, surgeon de la charité" (IV, ch. 34); you are so detached from "ces impertinentes récréations" (IV, ch. 33) that you do not enjoy them. This is far from the alleged "harmony" of "enjoying simultaneously this world and the next" (p. 86) which could allow the notoriously scrupulous saint and his penitents to be—against all possibility—ascetics and worldlings at the same time. As to the incorrect art parallel with Rubens (p. 103), no distinction is made between the counterreformatory directions of the Church authorities and the purposely contrived counteractions against them on the part of the artists.

About the four remaining authors I am not in a position to refer to previous critical work but I offer some suggestions. Jean de La Ceppède's *Théorèmes* as "Mathematics *a lo divino*" have all the tendencies of a mannered circumlocution of Scriptural matters, so that they are certainly closer to Malherbe's manneristic *Larmes de Saint Pierre* than to his baroque *Odes* (see E. O. Borgerhoff, "Mannerism and Baroque," *CL,* 1 [1953], 323-31). They have even something of the Rhétoriqueur tradition. Also this much is certain, that La Ceppède's infinite has nothing to do with Wölfflin's "open form" (p. 125). Wölfflin as an art historian stresses that his categories only concern the way of looking at formal objects.

Saint-Amant, "above all amusing" (p. 136), belongs to the burlesque orbit of Marino. Odette de Mourgues's exclusive identification of the burlesque with the baroque is all the more unfortunate as even the Italians are concentrating now on the *barocco moderato,* a problem

already seen by the theoreticians of the seventeenth century (see Franco Croce, "I critici moderato-barocchi," *Rassegna della letteratura Italiana* [1955-56, reprint: 76 pp.]). Saint-Amant rather has a late Renaissance *maniera* inaugurated by Teofilo Folengo, when for instance he calls Venus "La garce qui nasquit de l'excrement de l'onde." Corneille's corrections, although he never gets rid of the manneristic-rhetorical way of catering with happy endings to popular taste (see p. 210; and 264-5 in Wylie Sypher; also Georges May, *Tragédie cornélienne, tragédie racinienne*), actually do move definitely from the mannered, overdone metaphor to the much more *précieux*, half-metaphoric metonomy which is typical of the French baroque. Of course, Mr. Buffum says, from "Baroque" to "Classicism." As to the characterization of *Saint Genest* as French baroque with the implication of early baroque in France, influenced by Spanish full baroque (see Wilhelm Fries, *Der Stil der Theaterstücke Rotrous*, Diss., Munich, 1933), there would be no objection.

Mr. Buffum did not consider the fact that there is at stake the serious problem of a common European literary historiography which has the task not to maintain but to explain French classicism as a moderate baroque in order to adjust it to the literature of the rest of Europe. May I recall that comparative literature also understands the so-called German classicism as a part of European romanticism despite the fact that the Germans from their national viewpoint cling desperately to their allegedly unique classicism. But Mr. Buffum fears "what appears almost heretical at the Sorbonne" (pp. 163, 193, closer to truth p. 207). Epistemologically there seem to exist problems with which only the literary "comparatiste" is able to cope (see Franco Simone, "Per la definizione di un Barocco Francese," *Rivista di Letterature Moderne*, 1954, pp. 165-92, and "La Storia letteraria francese. Formazione e dissoluzione dello schema storiografico classico," *Rivista di Letterature Moderne*" 1952, pp. 1-22). Since serious representatives of history, art, music, and literature have independently come to a certain agreement on the meaning of the baroque (see Wolfgang Stechow, "The Baroque: a Critical Summary," *The Journal of Aesthetics*, XIV [1953], 165-74), it was not wise to try to reverse their results by programmatic, subjective, and less convincing interpretations.

Catholic University of America HELMUT HATZFELD

Jean Rotrou, *Venceslas*, ed. W. Leiner (Saarbrücken: West-Ost-Verlag, 1956. lx + 103 pp. Schriften der Universität des Saarlandes). WE already have four modern editions of *Venceslas*: T. F. Crane (Ginn: 1907), *Classiques de l'Odéon* (1920), Guy de la Batut (Hatier, 1924), Félix Hémon in *Théâtre choisi de Rotrou* (Garnier, 1925). But none of these editions is really a critical text, and not all are available. The present edition should fill a real need.

The introduction studies the sources of *Venceslas*: the literary sources, Francisco de Rojas Zorilla's *No hay ser padre siendo rey* (1640), and Guillen de Castro y Belvis' *La piedad en la justicia* (1623-25); the historical sources of which M. Leiner considers the possibilities, concluding: " Il résulte clairement qu'il n'est pas permis d'invoquer un modèle historique que le poète aurait suivi consciemment "; the personal reasons for Rotrou's choice of a Spanish source, which were perhaps the example set by the popularity of Corneille's *Cid,* drawn from such a source, and his own liking for Spanish material as shown in other works. There is also a possibility that he hoped to flatter the influential Anne of Austria, who was a Spanish princess. The choice of a story with a Polish setting could have been suggested to Rotrou by the great interest shown by court circles in Polish affairs. In addition, the setting and plot were similar to those he favored in other plays.

Another part of the introduction is devoted to a comparison of *Venceslas* with its sources and a study of the influence of Corneille; enough passages and lines are cited from the latter's *Cid, Cinna,* and *Médée* to show a considerable debt.

For the text reproduced here, M. Leiner chose the edition published by Sommaville in 1648 (B. N. rés. yf377), but also studied and compared the revisions of Marmontel (1759) and of Colardeau-Lekain (1774), and used other copies containing variants printed in 1648 and 1655 by Sommaville to amend the reading when they improved the basic text. Though *Venceslas* had but one performance during the life of the author, it has had many since, as shown by the extensive list with dates given by the editor.

On the whole this is an excellent edition, well printed, with extensive bibliography, and a minimum of misprints. The only reservation to be made is that the notes are so arranged that reference to them is rather cumbersome.

The University of Texas LANCASTER E. DABNEY

John C. Prevost, *Le Dandysme en France (1817-1839)* (Geneva: Droz, and Paris: Minard, 1957. 213 pp.). THIS study of French dandyism from 1817 to 1839 is preceded by introductory chapters on England and English influences. Mr. Prevost distinguishes carefully between the English dandy and his French counterpart who substitutes "désinvolture" for coldness and imperturbability. He also traces the French origins of dandyism back to the *petit-maître* and the *muscadin*.

"Militant" dandyism, in social life as well as in literary expression, is treated separately from the portrayal of dandies in literary works. One might wish that the opposition and connection between these two aspects were in sharper focus. Dandies in novels and poems are frequently objects of satire. Satire of dandies is quite different from dandy behavior. The two are not really poles apart, however, since the motives of satire are often ambiguous. It is a fact that most creators of fictive dandies were accused of being dandies themselves or even laid claim to the title at some time in their lives.

Mr. Prevost does not try to elucidate this relationship between a writer's dandies and the same writer's dandyism. This prudence has probably happier results with Musset and even Balzac than with Stendhal. Dandyism is affectation but, in the young Henri Beyle, it is also hatred of affectation. In a world of universal "cant" the first response of a wounded, sensitive ego must be more cant. Stendhal outgrows cant as he becomes able to fight it with ridicule. Can the Stendhal of later years still be called a dandy, in any sense of the term? This later Stendhal is precisely the creator of Count d'Aubigné, *alias* de Nerwinde, who ruins himself with "prudence," even "avarice," and sees in Lamiel a *primeur* to be exhibited to envious friends. This character, one of the most comical in Stendhal, should perhaps figure, and figure very high, in the list of his dandies. He never smiles, never thinks, and belongs to the Jockey Club. He is the closest thing to a pure breed dandy Stendhal has ever depicted.

Stendhal's dandyism is inseparable from the wider problems of sincerity and consciousness of originality. Mr. Prevost tries not to get involved in these problems, but he ends up attributing to dandyism Stendhal's "dégoût affecté pour la France" and even his praise of Italy. Few Stendhalians will follow the critic on this ground and fewer still when dandyism, again, is invoked to account for Stendhal's "mépris du grand public et [son] désir de se tenir au-dessus de la masse des hommes." Admirers of Stendhal will hold to the belief that all was not affectation there.

Mr. Prevost has assembled and organized a great mass of widely scattered material. His study is always informative and interesting. Critics, so far, have been more interested in the later, "metaphysical" dandyism of Baudelaire and Barbey d'Aurevilly than with the early period. This work fills a gap in our knowledge of a most curious social and literary phenomenon of the nineteenth century.

Johns Hopkins University RENE GIRARD

Lucie Horner, *Baudelaire critique de Delacroix* (Geneva: Droz, 1956. x + 200 pp.). AS Baudelaire was the least fallible and probably the most original critic of his century, it is hardly surprising that so many studies have been devoted to this essential aspect of his genius. Like Diderot, Baudelaire wrote his most important criticism in the field of painting; unlike Diderot, he unfortunately lived at a time when the plastic arts had reached their nadir. And naturally, he was quick to recognize the outstanding master of his age, Eugène Delacroix.

Although much has been written about Baudelaire and Delacroix, Dr. Horner's thesis is proof enough that the subject had by no means been exhausted. Indeed, there is scarcely an important literary work, however known, that a new approach cannot illuminate. And *Baudelaire critique de Delacroix* differs from previous studies particularly in the use of a new method. Mrs. Horner has limited her investigation to Baudelaire's comments on Delacroix, with very few references to his other critical writings or to his poetry. In fact, if Charles Baudelaire had been merely a *critique d'art*—if his literary efforts had been confined to the *Salons,* to the "Exposition universelle de 1855," and to the "Notice nécrologique"—this study could still have been pursued in much the same manner. Mrs. Horner's self-imposed limitations have certainly facilitated her task; and, by eliminating almost to the vanishing point the dangers of conjecture, they lend an air of complete objectivity to her thesis. As a result of these limitations, Baudelaire's art criticism is no longer considered, as in previous studies, as one of the manifestations of his creative personality or of his philosophy; and although the opening chapter does contain an intellectual biography of the poet, this material is used mainly to show his competence in the realm of painting. Indeed, Dr. Horner is more interested in assembling credentials than in discovering causes—and this comment is hardly meant as an adverse

criticism of the book, for the author is primarily interested in showing by what means and to what extent Baudelaire contributed to contemporary knowledge and appreciation of Delacroix's accomplishments as a painter.

In many respects *Baudelaire critique de Delacroix* could have been entitled, with equal justice, *Delacroix devant ses contemporains,* a title already appropriated by M. Tourneux way back in 1886. Nearly half the book is devoted to the reactions, favorable or unfavorable, of critics and journalists (other than Baudelaire) to the paintings of Delacroix. The author follows the chronological order throughout; and besides bringing a wealth of new material—for her study is more discriminating and far more complete than Tourneux's critical bibliography—she manages to situate Baudelaire's writings on Delacroix in their historical perspective. However, if Dr. Horner had been completely faithful to her approach, Baudelaire might have become just another important critic who had something to say about the art of Delacroix, and her thesis would then have been the responsibility of the Art department! The situation is saved not only by the title (which covers approximately half the book), but by occasional and unavoidable attempts at dramatization: throughout the thesis, Baudelaire is cast (deservedly!) in the star role, as the hero of the piece, with Delécluze, Maxime Du Camp, *et al.* sharing the part of villain. Moreover, Dr. Horner frequently resorts to dramatics of a stylistic nature, for instance:

> Parmi les nouveaux-venus, lors de l'ouverture du Salon de 1845, il y avait deux jeunes hommes qui devaient percer à travers les rangs de leurs confrères. L'un, du nom d'Eugène Fromentin, originaire de La Rochelle, donne son compte-rendu à une feuille de sa ville natale; l'autre, un jeune Parisien celui-ci, publia son *Salon* en brochure; son nom était Charles Baudelaire. (p. 55)

It would seem that with the stress being automatically placed on Delacroix who, merely by producing new works, must always make the first move, Mrs. Horner feels the need to reestablish the balance between painter and critics by artificially heightening the importance of the latter. Nevertheless, the reader often receives the impression that this study recounts the mad pursuit of the unattainable, until Baudelaire finally nails his man in the "Notice nécrologique." This impression is somewhat confirmed by the (probably valid) opinion that the whole truth about Delacroix is to be found in the writings of Baudelaire, with glimmers of correct appreciation appearing in

the pronouncements of lesser critics (to whom Dr. Horner gives full credit for their insight).

This dramatization, far from detracting from the value of the thesis, makes it far more readable by somehow disguising the numerous repetitions, unavoidable in this type of study. And *Baudelaire critique de Delacroix* is, in a double sense, a genuine contribution, for it definitely adds both to our knowledge of Baudelaire the critic and to our understanding of art criticism in the XIXth century. Mrs. Horner is by no means content to state the various ways in which Delacroix was misunderstood during his lifetime, but she convincingly explains this blindness. Otherwise intelligent writers such as Delécluze were so used to the precise, linear drawing of the school of Louis David as well as to the "ideal" representations of religious and historical events, that Delacroix's imaginative departures from convention merely served to shock them. On the other hand, we discover that many of the apparently original ideas of Baudelaire can be found, sporadically, in the commentaries of other critics such as Thiers (or was it Baron Gros?), Gautier, Stendhal, Dumas père, Heine, Jal, Thoré, and many others. Baudelaire's criticism of Delacroix is merely more personal, more passionate, and his powers of analysis, generalization and expression far greater (in the field of painting) than those of any of his predecessors. Moreover, Baudelaire was able to give a philosophical twist to his comments and thus pave the way to *une conception esthétique moderne de l'œuvre d'art en général* (p. 188). Thus, Dr. Horner very cleverly reveals the poet's indebtedness to previous art critics for a large share of his ideas, and at the same time clearly demonstrates his superiority over his predecessors.

Mrs. Horner quotes abundantly, and her textual criticism is often acute. Her apparently arbitrary limitation of the subject has, all in all, yielded positive results. But, by its very limitations, this thesis cannot be regarded as definitive, and rather than exhausting the subject, it opens new fields for investigation. There is indeed room for several unashamedly speculative studies, full of brilliant conjecture, in the manner of André Malraux or, better still, of René Huyghe, in which both Baudelaire and Delacroix would be considered as creative artists and compared as such.

University of California, Los Angeles J. D. HUBERT

George C. Schoolfield, *The Figure of the Musician in German Literature* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1956. xv + 204 pp. Univ. of North Carolina Studies in the Germanic Languages and Literatures, 19). CONSIDERING the importance of music in the cultural and social life of Germany, especially in the 19th century, and the many reflections of this importance in the fiction and drama of that century and our own, it is surprising that Mr. Schoolfield's topic has not been treated heretofore. His study, therefore, attempts to fill a definite need of the literary historian and the musicologist whose interests lie in the study of interrelations between the arts. The greatest value of this book lies in the industrious compilation of material and Mr. Schoolfield's care in giving at least cursory synopses of almost each work treated. It can thus serve as a basis for future studies. These are moreover still badly needed, for the author never succeeds in disentangling the various points of view from which he seems to wish us to consider his material. It never becomes clear in connection with any given work of literature whether the sociological and psychological problems of the musician, the tracing of musician-types, or the ideological, aesthetic, or *geistesgeschichtliche* aspects of music itself are the chief concern of the author.

The author's selection of works, which he defends in his preface, is at least open to question: it does not seem to serve any purpose to include, for instance, Strauss' *Freund Hein* and Friedrich Huch's *Enzio*, if the author himself feels that "neither Heiner nor Enzio has to be a musician in order to carry out his creator's purpose: they could as easily be painters or poets (p. 114)." Yet the point is precisely this: Why are they musicians and *not* painters or poets? That certain items do not appear in the bibliography (e. g. Bartsch's *Die Schauer im Don Giovanni*, especially as compared to Mörike's Mozart novella, and Rolland's *Jean Christophe* and its influence should certainly have been mentioned at least in passing), is more easily overlooked than the detailed and space-consuming discussion of a good many works devoid of any particular literary or musico-historical significance.

If one were to select one among the all-too-many debatable points in the study, the most serious criticism could probably be leveled against the author's apparent lack of thorough acquaintance with the history of music and the musicology of the period with which he deals. Thus, he does not seem to see the central problem of *Der*

Kraft-Mayr, which is, of course, a defense of the "new music" of the Wagnerians. He unmercifully lambasts Brachvogel's harmless *Professorenroman, Friedemann Bach,* without any realization of how much this piece of popularization (which is, admittedly, poor literature) contributed to the re-awakening of a wide and intelligent interest in the elder Bach. He does not see that some of the music of Wassermann's Daniel Nothafft stems directly from Mahler, that Stoessel's *Sonnenmelodie* deals with the musical theories of Hauer, not Schoenberg, and his discussion of the musical problems of *Dr. Faustus* is hardly competent from a musicological point of view. One of the best passages in the book, from the discussion of *Dr. Faustus,* characteristically consists of a well-composed paragraph about the incest problem in this work (pp. 183 f.), not of a musical discussion. The countless value-judgments on music and literary productions are too often given without any attempts at justification.

The whole book seems to have emerged from an original consideration of Hoffmann's Kapellmeister Kreisler. Practically every musician under discussion is somehow compared to Kreisler and the female figures to Kreisler's Julia—a procedure which is rather wearing on the reader, even if he does not want to question its germaneness.

There are a good number of discerning attempts at exposition of problems concerning music and the musician in the book. Yet the author has not endeavored to give even tentative answers to the questions raised. It is a pity that he did not see fit to add a formal concluding and summarizing chapter and to re-organize his material before the apparently somewhat premature publication of his Princeton dissertation. The chief virtue of Mr. Schoolfield's study lies in the fact that it exposes and calls to our attention for the first time a problem which far transcends those treated in the usual compilations of the "The figure of the . . . in . . ." type.

University of Maryland WERNER J. FRIES

G. Turville-Petre, ed., *Hervarar saga ok Heiðreks,* Introduction by Christopher Tolkien (London: Viking Society for Northern Research, 1956. xx + 71, 73-145 pp.). THIS is the second volume of a series of editions, like the first one, made up of a text made in Iceland by Guðni Jónsson for the Íslendingasagnaútgáfan. Professor Tolkien has written a valuable introduction to the saga text, while

the general editor has written the notes and the glossary and the indices. Turville-Petre's name is full guarantee of good scholarly work; I have read the notes and sampled the glossary without detecting any errors, hardly even a printer's error. I have only one and rather weak suggestion about his interpretation of *drykkjar drynhraun*. This must mean an ox's skull as is correctly stated in the glossary under *drynhraun*, the whole phrase being translated "the bellowing (*dryn*) rock (*hraun*) of drink." It is quite true that *hraun* is "rock," but *hraun* may also mean "the bones of cattle or horses with some meat left hung up into the fire-house to be smoked." But one must admit, the head of cattle were not usually so treated. So perhaps one is not much nearer a solution by adopting the meaning "bone" rather than "rock" for the *hraun* in question.

As Professor Tolkien states in the introduction, this is a very important *fornaldar saga* (heroic saga), for several reasons. It contains two Eddic type poems, the very ancient-looking *Hlöðskviða*, with parallels from *Wídsíþ*, echoing battles between Goths and Huns in the neighborhood of Dniepr (*á Danpar stöðum*) and not too far from the Carpathians (*Harvaða fjöll*). The other poem is *Hervararkviða* often called the "Waking of Angantýr." Finally, the saga contains *Heiðreksgátur*, the only collection of riddles existing in Old Icelandic and, as Professor Tolkien tells us, quite different not only from riddle collections in Europe and England but also from the rich later collections in Iceland.

All in all, this saga is among the most interesting of sagas and the editors deserve thanks for bringing out such a fine student's edition of it.

The Johns Hopkins University STEFAN EINARSSON

Index

AUTHORS OF ARTICLES

AUTHORS OF REVIEWS AND OF BOOKS REVIEWED

og-

on-
13-

Me-
og-
he
pe,

ch,
oc.
ry,
W.

49
ei-
74
ck
g.
ic
ry

es

llas 1